

Proceedings of the
Twenty-Fourth Annual Convention
of the
National Collegiate Athletic Association
January 1, 1930

This is the best copy available.

Pages 19, 20, 21 and 22 are incomplete.

CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

HONORARY PRESIDENT

Brigadier General Palmer E. Pierce, Room 1616, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

PRESIDENT

Professor Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

COUNCIL

(In addition to the President and Secretary the following vice-presidents,
ex officio.)

First District, Professor A. W. Marsh, Amherst College.
Second District, Dean R. L. Sackett, Penn State College.
Third District, Dean S. V. Sanford, University of Georgia.
Fourth District, Professor O. F. Long, Northwestern University.
Fifth District, Dean S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College.
Sixth District, Professor D. A. Penick, University of Texas.
Seventh District, Professor H. L. Marshall, University of Utah.
Eighth District, Professor W. B. Owens, Stanford University.

*Members at Large**

Major J. L. Griffith, Western Intercollegiate Conference.
Dr. J. E. Raycroft, Princeton University.
Director W. J. Bingham, Harvard University.
Dean C. E. F Riley, Texas A. & M. College.
Professor L. W. St. John, Ohio State University.
Mr. Romeyn Berry, Cornell University.
Professor N. W. Dougherty, University of Tennessee.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The president and secretary, *ex officio*
 Major J. L. Griffith Dean S. W. Beyer Professor L. W. St. John
 Dr. J. E. Raycroft Director W. J. Bingham Professor O. F. Long
 Mr. Romeyn Berry

* Elected by the Council.

ROLL OF MEMBERS

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

- Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., Bradford Knapp, LL.B., D.Agr., President.
- Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., James A. Beebe, D.D., LL.D., President.
- Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., Arthur S. Pease, Ph.D., President.
- Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Samuel P. Brooks, LL.D., President.
- Boston College, Boston, Mass., Rev. James H. Dolan, President.
- Boston University, Boston, Mass., Daniel L. Marsh, D.D., President.
- Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., President.
- Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill., Frederic R. Hamilton, Ph.D., President.
- Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Parke R. Kolbe, Ph.D., President.
- Brown University, Providence, R. I., Clarence A. Barbour, S.T.D., LL.D.
- Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., Robert J. Aley, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., Donald J. Cowling, D.D., LL.D., President.
- Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa., Thomas S. Baker, Ph.D., President.
- Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, William E. Wickenden, President.
- Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., Right Rev. James H. Ryan, D.D., President.
- Centenary College, Shreveport, La., George S. Sexton, D.D., President.
- Centre College, Danville, Ky., Charles J. Turck, M.A., LL.B., President.
- Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y., Joseph Eugene Rowe, Ph.D., President.
- Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C., Enoch W. Sikes, Ph.D., President.
- Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Harry M. Gage, LL.D., President.
- Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., George B. Cutten, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President.
- College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y., Frederick B. Robinson, Ph.D., President.
- College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn., Rev. M. A. Schumacher, A.B., S.T.B., President.
- College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, Charles F. Wishart, D.D., President.
- Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Col., Charles A. Lory, D.Sc., LL.D.
- Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Connecticut Agricultural College, Storrs, Conn., George Alan Works, Ed.D., President.
- Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., Livingston Farrand, M.D., LL.D., President.
- Creighton University, Omaha, Neb., William H. Agnew, President.
- Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., Ernest M. Hopkins, LL.D., President.
- Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Avery A. Shaw, D.D., President.

- DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., G. Bromley Oxnam, D.D., President.
- Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., Mervin G. Filler, Litt.D., President.
- Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Daniel W. Morehouse, Ph.D., President.
- Duke University, Durham, N. C., William P. Few, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., Very Rev. M. A. Hehir, President.
- Elon College, North Carolina, William A. Harper, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
- Fordham University, New York, N. Y., Rev. William J. Duane, President.
- Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Rev. Henry H. Apple, D.D., LL.D., President.
- Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., McLeod M. Pearce, D.D., President.
- Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., Rev. W. C. Nevils, Ph.D., President.
- Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., Marion L. Brittain, LL.D., President.
- Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., Henry W. A. Hanson, President.
- Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, John H. T. Main, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., Frederick C. Ferry, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
- Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., Abbott Lawrence Lowell, LL.D., Ph.D., President.
- Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., W. W. Comfort, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.
- Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., Murray Bartlett, D.D., LL.D., President.
- Howard University, Washington, D. C., Mordecai W. Johnson, D.D., President.
- Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., William L. Bryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass., L. L. Doggett, Ph.D., President.
- Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Raymond M. Hughes, M.S., President.
- John B. Stetson University, De Land, Fla., Lincoln Hulley, Ph.D., President.
- Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Joseph G. Ames, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kans., F. D. Farrell, Agr.D., President.
- Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., Albert Britt, Litt.D., President.
- Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., William M. Lewis, M.A., President.
- Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., Henry M. Wriston, Ph.D., President.
- Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Charles R. Richards, E.M., LL.D., President.
- Loyola University, New Orleans, La., Very Rev. F. D. Sullivan, M.A., President.
- Manhattan College, New York, N. Y., Brother Cornelius, President.
- Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., William M. Magee, S. J., President.
- Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass., Roscoe W. Thatcher, D.Agr., LL.D., President.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., Samuel W. Stratton, D.Sc., Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Alfred H. Upham, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., Robert S. Shaw, B.S.A., President.

- Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich., Charles McKenny, LL.D., President.
- Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., Paul Dwight Moody, D.D., President.
- Mississippi A. and M. College, Agricultural College, Miss., B. M. Walker, President.
- Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., Monsignor B. J. Bradley, LL.D., President.
- Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, W. H. McMaster, D.D., LL.D., President.
- New York University, New York, N. Y., Elmer Ellsworth Brown, LL.D., Chancellor.
- North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, West Raleigh, N. C., Eugene C. Brooks, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
- Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Walter D. Scott, Ph.D., President.
- Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Charles A. Plumley, LL.D., President.
- Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Ernest H. Wilkins, Ph.D., President.
- Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, George W. Rightmire, M.A., President.
- Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, Elmer B. Bryan, L.H.D., LL.D., President.
- Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Edmund D. Soper, D.D., President.
- Oregon Agricultural College, Corvallis, Ore., William J. Kerr, President.
- Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., Charles E. Hyatt, LL.D., President.
- Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Ralph D. Hetzel, LL.D., Litt.D., President.
- Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., John G. Hibben, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., Edward C. Elliott, Ph.D., President.
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., Palmer C. Ricketts, C.E., LL.D., President.
- Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I., Howard Edwards, LL.D., President.
- Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, Edgar O. Lovett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., John M. Thomas, D.D., LL.D., President.
- St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., Enoch B. Garey, LL.D., President.
- St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y., Richard Eddy Sykes, M.S., D.D., President.
- St. Stephen's College, Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y., Bernard I. Bell, D.D., Warden.
- Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, C. C. Selecman, D.D., President.
- Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal., Robert E. Swain, Ph.D., Acting President.
- State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash., Ernest O. Holland, Ph.D., President.
- State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, Walter A. Jessup, Ph.D., President.
- Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., H. N. Davis, Ph.D., President.
- Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa., Rev. G. M. Smith, President.
- Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Frank Aydelotte, B.Litt. (Oxon.), President.

- Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Charles W. Flint, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor.
- Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles E. Beury, LL.B., President.
- Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Texas, Thomas O. Walton, President.
- Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., Rev. Remsen B. Ogilby, LL.D., President.
- Tufts College, Medford, Mass., John A. Cousens, LL.D., President.
- Tulane University, New Orleans, La., A. B. Dinwiddie, LL.D., President.
- Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Frank Parker Day, LL.D., Litt.D., President.
- United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., Capt. Harry G. Hamlet, U. S. C. G., Superintendent.
- United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Major General William R. Smith, U. S. A., Superintendent.
- United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Rear Admiral S. F. Robison, U. S. N., Superintendent.
- University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, George F. Zook, Ph.D., President.
- University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., Samuel P. Capen, Ph.D., President.
- University of California, Berkeley, Cal., William W. Campbell, LL.D., President.
- University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Robert M. Hutchings, M.A., LL.B.
- University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, Herman Schneider, President.
- University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., George Norlin, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio, Rev. B. P. O'Reilly, B.A., President.
- University of Delaware, Newark, Del., Walter Hulihan, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., President.
- University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., Rev. J. P. McNichols, S.J., A.M., President.
- University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., John J. Tigert, D.C.L., LL.D., President.
- University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., Charles M. Snelling, Sc.D., President.
- University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., David Kinley, Ph.D., President.
- University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., Ernest H. Lindley, Ph.D., Chancellor.
- University of Maine, Orono, Me., Harold S. Boardman, C.E., LL.D., President.
- University of Maryland, College Park, Md., Raymond A. Pearson, LL.D., D. Agr., President.
- University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Alexander G. Ruthven, Ph.D., President.
- University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Lotus D. Coffman, Ph.D., President.
- University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Stratton D. Brooks, LL.D., President.
- University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., Edgar A. Burnett, Sc.D., Chancellor.
- University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Edward M. Lewis, LL.D., President.
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Harry Woodburn Chase, Ph.D., President.
- University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., Rev. C. L. O'Donnell, President.
- University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., W. B. Bizzell, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
- University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., Arnold B. Hall, J. D., President.
- University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Josiah H. Penniman, Ph.D., LL.D., Provost.
- University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., John G. Bowman, LL.D., Chancellor.

University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Rush Rhees, D.D., LL.D., President.
 University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., Benjamin F. Finney, LL.D., President.
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., R. B. von Kleinsmid, Sc.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., H. A. Morgan, LL.D., President.
 University of Texas, Austin, Texas, H. Y. Benedict, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, George Thomas, Ph.D., President.
 University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Guy W. Bailey, LL.D., President.
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Edwin A. Alderman, D.C.L., LL.D., President.
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., M. Lyle Spencer, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., Harold W. Foght, Ph.D., President.
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Glenn Frank, Litt.D., LL.D., President.
 Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind., W. H. T. Dau, President.
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Chancellor.
 Villanova College, Villanova, Pa., Rev. James H. Griffin, LL.D., O.S.A., President.
 Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., William H. Cocke, C.E., B.L., President.
 Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. Car., Francis P. Gaines, President.
 Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., G. R. Throop, Ph.D., Chancellor.
 Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., Simon Strousse Baker, LL.D., President.
 Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., Henry L. Smith, Ph.D., President.
 Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., James L. McConaughy, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich., Dwight B. Waldo, LL.D., President.
 West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va., Homer E. Wark, Ph.D., President.
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., John R. Turner, Ph.D., President.
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Harry A. Garfield, LL.D., President.
 Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, Rees E. Tulloss, Ph.D., LL.D., President.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., Captain Ralph Earle, U. S. N., President.
 Yale University, New Haven, Conn., James Rowland Angell, Litt.D., President.

ALLIED MEMBERS

The Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference, comprising:

University of Colorado	Utah Agricultural College
Colorado State School of Mines	Colorado Agricultural College
Colorado College	Colorado State Teachers College
University of Denver	Western State Teachers College
Brigham Young University	Montana State College
University of Utah	University of Wyoming

The Kansas College Athletic Association, comprising:

Bethany College	Ottawa University
St. Mary's College	McPherson College
Baker University	Kansas Wesleyan University

The Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Conference, comprising:

Oregon Agricultural College	Willamette University
College of Idaho	Pacific University
College of Puget Sound	Linfield College
Whitman College	

The Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Union University	Lincoln University
Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute	North Carolina State College
Virginia Theological Seminary and College	North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College
Shaw University	Howard University
	Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute.

The Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

College of Emporia	Kansas State Teachers College of
Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia	Pittsburgh
Kansas State Teachers College of Hays	Municipal University of Wichita
	Southwestern College
	Washburn College

Indiana Intercollegiate Conference, comprising:

Ball State Teachers College	Indiana State Teachers College
Butler University	Indiana University
Central Normal College	Manchester College
Concordia College	Normal College, A. G. U.
DePauw University	Oakland City College
Earlham College	Purdue University
Evansville College	Rose Polytechnic Institute
Franklin College	University of Notre Dame
Hanover College	Valparaiso University
Huntington College	Vincennes University
Indiana Central College	Wabash College

The Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

California Institute of Technology	San Diego State Teachers College
Occidental College	University of Redlands
Pomona College	Whittier College
La Verne College	

The Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Beloit College	Knox College
Carleton College	Lawrence College
Coe College	Monmouth College
Cornell College	Ripon College
Hamline University	

The Michigan Collegiate Conference, comprising:

Central State Normal School	College of the City of Detroit
Michigan State Normal College	Western State Normal School

The Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Iowa State College	University of Missouri
Kansas State Agricultural College	University of Nebraska
University of Kansas	University of Oklahoma

The Ohio College Athletic Conference, comprising:

Baldwin Wallace College	Mount Union College
Capital University	Muskingum College
Case School of Applied Science	Oberlin College
College of Wooster	Ohio Northern University
Heidelberg University	Ohio State University
Hiram College	Otterbein College
Kenyon College	University of Dayton
Marietta College	Western Reserve University

The Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bucknell University	Muhlenberg College
Columbia University	New York University
University of Delaware	University of Pennsylvania
Drexel Institute	Pennsylvania Military College
Franklin and Marshall College	Princeton University
Gettysburg College	Rutgers College
Haverford College	Stevens Institute
Johns Hopkins University	Susquehanna University
Juniata College	Ursinus College
Lebanon Valley College	Washington College
Lehigh University	

The Southwest Athletic Conference, comprising:

Baylor University	Texas University
Rice Institute	University of Arkansas
Southern Methodist University	Texas Christian University
A. & M. College of Texas	

The Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bridgewater College	Randolph-Macon College
Emory and Henry College	Roanoke College
Hampden-Sydney College	University of Richmond
Lynchburg College	William and Mary College

The Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Oregon Agricultural College	University of Oregon
Stanford University	University of Southern California
State College of Washington	University of Washington
State University of Montana	University of California, Southern
University of California	Branch
University of Idaho	

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Andover Academy, Andover, Mass.
 Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
 Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.
 New York Military Academy, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y.
 Rochester Athenaeum, Rochester, N. Y.
 The Principia, St. Louis, Mo.
 University School, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Worcester Academy, Worcester, Mass.

PROCEEDINGS

The Twenty-fourth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association met at the Hotel Astor, New York City, at nine-thirty o'clock on January 1, 1930, President Pierce in the chair. The minutes of the last convention having been issued in printed form, the reading of the minutes was dispensed with.

The record of attendance was as follows:

I. Members:

Alabama Polytechnic Institute: Professor C. L. Hare, Professor J. C. Floyd.
 Alfred University: Director E. A. Heers.
 Allegheny College: Professor C. E. Hammett.
 Amherst College: Professor A. W. Marsh, Professor C. Scott Porter.
 Bates College: Professor Oliver F. Cutts.
 Baylor University: Director Morley Jennings.
 Boston University: Dr. A. S. Begg, Mr. Joseph E. Brown.
 Bowdoin College: Professor M. E. Morrell, Mr. John J. Magee, Mr. Ben Houser.
 Brown University: Professor F. W. Marvel, Dean Samuel T. Arnold, Professor Leslie E. Swain.
 Butler University: Director George Clark.
 Carnegie Institute of Technology: Dean Arthur W. Tarbell.
 Clarkson College: President Joseph E. Rowe, Dean Frederick C. Wilson.
 Colgate University: Professor J. H. Starr.
 College of the City of New York: Professor Walter Williamson, Director Frederic A. Woll.
 Colorado Agricultural College: Director H. W. Hughes.
 Columbia University: Professor Edward S. Elliott, Mr. E. C. Davis, Mr. Louis Little, Mr. Edward T. Kennedy, Mr. J. A. Torney, Jr., Mr. Russell E. Wight.
 Connecticut Agricultural College: Professor Sumner A. Dole.
 Creighton University: Professor C. A. Wynne.
 Dartmouth College: Professor Harry L. Hillman, Professor Havey W. Gohn, Associate Professor Robert L. Delahanty, Associate Professor P. J. Kaney.
 Denison University: Professor W. J. Livingston.
 DePauw University: Professor W. L. Hughes.
 Fordham University: Rev. Charles J. Deane, Mr. John F. Coffey.
 Franklin and Marshall College: Dean Howard R. Omwake.
 Geneva College: Professor Robert Park, Professor Mack Fleniken.
 Georgia School of Technology: Dr. J. B. Crenshaw, Professor A. H. Armstrong, Mr. W. A. Alexander.
 Gettysburg College: Mr. C. E. Bilheimer.
 Grinnell College: Associate Professor Lester L. Watt, Mr. Lewis R. Barrett.
 Hamilton College: Director Albert I. Prettyman, Director A. R. Winters, Director J. M. Gelas, Associate Professor M. A. Weber.
 Harvard University: Director William J. Bingham, Assistant Director Henry W. Clark, Mr. C. B. VanWyck, Mr. Norman W. Fradd, Mr. A. W. Samborski.
 Haverford College: Mr. Harvey J. Harman.
 Hobart College: President Murray Bartlett, Mr. Vincent S. Welch.
 Howard University: Dean Edward P. Davis.

Indiana University: Professor Z. G. Clevenger, Assistant Professor H. O. Page.
 International Y. M. C. A. College: Professor G. B. Affleck, Professor H. S. DeGroat, Professor L. J. Judd, Professor E. W. Pennock, Professor T. K. Cureton, Mr. Lawrence L. Doggett, Professor J. L. Rothacher, Mr. George E. Goss, Mr. Leslie Mann.
 Iowa State College: Dean S. W. Beyer, Professor T. N. Metcalf, Mr. Frank Honaker, Mr. Noel Workman.
 John B. Stetson University: President Lincoln Hulley.
 Johns Hopkins University: Dr. Ray VanOrman, Mr. Henry Iddins.
 Kansas State College: Mr. M. F. Ahearn.
 Lafayette College: Professor H. W. Church, Professor H. A. Lorenz, Mr. D. L. Reeves.
 Lehigh University: Mr. Walter R. Okeson, Mr. J. L. Beaver, Mr. J. G. Petrikin.
 Massachusetts Agricultural College: Professor Harold M. Gore, Professor Curry S. Hicks, Assistant Professor L. L. Derby, Dr. John A. Rockwell.
 Miami University: Professor George L. Rider, Assistant Professor Merlin A. Ditmer.
 Michigan State College: Dean J. F. Cox.
 Michigan State Normal College: Professor J. H. McCulloch, Mr. E. J. Rynearson.
 Middlebury College: Professor A. M. Brown, Professor B. H. Beck.
 Mount Union College: Director John M. Thorpe.
 New York University: Professor Giles L. Courtney, Assistant Professor Willard P. Ashbrook, Mr. John F. Mehan.
 Northwestern University: Professor O. F. Long, Professor K. L. Wilson.
 Oberlin College: Professor C. W. Savage, Dr. J. H. Nichols, Dr. W. L. Morrison.
 Ohio State University: Professor L. W. St. John, Professor Frank R. Castleman, Mr. G. M. Trautman.
 Ohio University: Professor O. C. Bird.
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Dean William L. Sanders, Professor G. E. Gauthier.
 Oregon State College: Dean Clair V. Langton, Mr. Paul T. Schissler.
 Pennsylvania State College: Dean R. L. Sackett, Mr. Neil M. Fleming.
 Princeton University: Dr. Joseph E. Raycroft, Dr. C. W. Kennedy, Dr. D. B. Sinclair, Mr. Albert B. Nies.
 Purdue University: Mr. Noble Kizer.
 Rhode Island State College: Professor Frank W. Keaney.
 Rice Institute: Professor Harry A. Scott.
 Rutgers University: Professor M. A. Blake, Professor James H. Reilly, Mr. Harry J. Rockafeller, Dean Fraser Metzger, Dean Walter T. Marvin.
 St. Lawrence University: Director Roy B. Clogston, Mr. Thomas T. Sullivan.
 Southern Methodist University: Professor J. S. McIntosh.
 Stanford University: Professor W. B. Owens.
 State College of Washington: Mr. Earl V. Foster.
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Director John A. Davis.
 Susquehanna University: Professor L. D. Grossman.
 Swarthmore College: Dr. E. LeRoy Mercer, Professor Charles G. Thatcher, Mr. Charles C. Miller.
 Syracuse University: Professor William J. Davison, Mr. George B. Thurston, Mr. Thomas F. Keane.
 Temple University: Dr. Carlton N. Russell.
 Texas Agricultural & Mechanical College: Dean Charles E. Friley, Mr. W. L. Penberthy.

Trinity College: Professor Ray Oosting.
 Tufts College: Professor Clarence P. Houston, Professor W. S. Yeager, Professor A. G. Sampson.
 Tulane University: Dr. Wilbur C. Smith.
 Union College: President Frank P. Day, Dean Charles F. F. Garis, Mr. Milton M. Enzer, Director Harold A. Bruce, Mr. J. Harold Wittner.
 U. S. Coast Guard Academy: Lieutenant L. H. Baker.
 U. S. Military Academy: Lieutenant Colonel Robert C. Richardson, Captain G. A. Counts.
 U. S. Naval Academy: Commander Herbert A. Jones, Lieutenant Commander F. G. Reinicke.
 University of Buffalo: Professor Charles H. Keene.
 University of California: Director W. W. Monahan.
 University of Chicago: Associate Professor H. O. Crisler, Assistant Professor C. O. Molander.
 University of Cincinnati: Professor R. George Babcock.
 University of Delaware: Assistant Professor E. P. Jolls, Mr. G. P. Doherty, Jr.
 University of Georgia: Dean S. V. Sanford, Major A. T. Colley, Mr. H. J. Stegeman, Mr. Frank W. Thomas, Mr. Charles E. Martin.
 University of Maine: Professor B. C. Kent.
 University of Maryland: Mr. H. C. Byrd.
 University of Michigan: Assistant Professor E. E. Wieman, Mr. Fielding H. Yost.
 University of Minnesota: Professor F. W. Luehring.
 University of Missouri: Professor C. L. Brewer.
 University of Nebraska: Dean T. J. Thompson, Dr. R. G. Clapp, Director H. D. Gish, Mr. Henry F. Schulte, Mr. D. X. Bible.
 University of New Hampshire: Professor W. H. Cowell.
 University of North Carolina: Director R. A. Fetzer, Mr. Charles T. Woollen.
 University of Oklahoma: Director Ben G. Owen.
 University of Notre Dame: Mr. Thomas J. Lieb.
 University of Pennsylvania: Dr. R. T. MacKenzie, Mr. William H. DuBarry, Mr. H. Jamison Swarts.
 University of Pittsburgh: Dean J. Steele Gow, Dr. P. V. McParland.
 University of Rochester: Dr. Edwin Fauver, Assistant Professor Walter Campbell, Mr. Matthew D. Lawless.
 University of the South: Dr. Michael S. Bennett.
 University of Tennessee: Professor N. W. Dougherty.
 University of Texas: Professor D. K. Brace, Professor H. J. Ettlinger, Mr. Clyde Littlefield, Mr. Roy B. Henderson, Mr. Roy Bedichek.
 University of Utah: Dr. H. L. Marshall.
 University of Vermont: Professor James E. Donahue.
 Vanderbilt University: Dr. L. C. Glenn.
 Villanova College: Professor Harry Stuhldreher, Mr. Charles A. McGeehan, Mr. Robert Reagan.
 Wake Forest College: Mr. Frank S. Miller.
 Washington University: Dr. Albert H. Sharpe.
 Wesleyan University: Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Dr. Edgar Fauver, Associate Professor J. F. Martin, Assistant Professor H. G. McCurdy.
 West Virginia University: Director H. A. Stansbury, Mr. Ira E. Rodgers.
 Williams College: Professor G. N. Messer, Assistant Professor Charles L. Graham.
 Wittenberg College: Professor Oliver K. Cornwell, Mr. T. William Stobbs, Jr.
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Professor P. R. Carpenter, Mr. Ivan E. Bigler.
 Yale University: Associate Professor John M. Cates, Mr. R. J. H. Kiputh.

II. Allied Members:

Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Professor C. R. Phipps.
 Kansas College Athletic Conference: Professor E. J. Cragoe.
 Middle Atlantic States Conference: Professor E. L. Mercer.
 Indiana Intercollegiate Conference: Professor W. H. Hughes.
 Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference: Director Robert K. Jaggard.
 Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Dean S. W. Beyer.
 Ohio College Athletic Conference: Dr. C. W. Savage.
 Pacific Coast Conference: Professor W. B. Owens.
 Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference: Professor D. B. Swingle.
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Professor D. A. Penick.

III. Associate Members:

Andover Academy: Dr. P. S. Page, Mr. Oswald Tower.
 Lawrenceville School: Mr. Lory Prentiss.
 Worcester Academy: Mr. Harold W. Presson.

IV. Non-Members:

Colby College: Professor C. Harry Edwards.
 Davidson College: Professor Norton G. Pritchett.
 Drew University: Mr. Albert B. Wegener.
 Hastings College: Director T. C. Young.
 High Point College: Director J. P. Boylin.
 Marshall College: Director Roy M. Hawley.
 Muskingum College: Mr. W. B. Stone.
 Northern Montana School: President G. H. VandeBogart.
 Providence College: Mr. John E. Farrell.
 Rose Polytechnic Institute: Director Phil C. Brown.
 St. Johns College: Director Raymond F. Lynch.
 Thiel College: Mr. G. F. Loeb.
 University of Iowa: Dr. Edward H. Lauer.

V. Individuals:

Dr. John Brown, Jr., National Council, Y. M. C. A., New York City.
 Mr. Daniel Chase, Sport Brotherhood, New York City.
 Dr. George W. Ehler, Boy Scouts of America, New York City.
 Director A. B. Forslund, Mount Hermon School.
 Mr. H. A. Hobson, New York State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y.
 Mr. Wendell D. Mansfield, High School, Winchester, Mass.
 Mr. C. M. Miles, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.
 Mr. W. W. H. Mustaine, New York State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
 Dr. D. Oberteuffer, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.
 Dr. Howard J. Savage, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
 Mr. Louis C. Schroeder, National Council of Y. M. C. A., Geneva, Switzerland.
 Mr. J. R. Sharman, State Department of Education, Montgomery, Alabama.
 Mr. John M. VanLiew, Coach of Latin America Olympic Track Team in Peru, Des Moines, Iowa.

MORNING SESSION

The following Committee on Credentials was appointed: Dr. C. W. Savage, Dr. Edwin Fauver.

The President gave his customary annual address which will be found on pages 76 to 82.

President George H. VandeBogart, of the Northern Montana School, read a paper on Intercollegiate Athletics and the Junior College. This and the two succeeding addresses will be found printed in the appendix, pages 83 to 104. The other addresses were by Dr. Howard J. Savage, of the Carnegie Foundation, on Aspects of the Relation of Education to College Sport, and by President Frank Parker Day, of Union College, on the Challenge of the Carnegie Report.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The afternoon session began at two-thirty o'clock. The Secretary-Treasurer read his report, stating that five meetings of the Executive Committee had been held during the year. He read in detail the minutes of the meeting of the night before on which action was taken by the Association as follows:

Voted to publish baseball rules, provided the Committee on Publications can make the necessary arrangements.

Recommendations concerning the make-up of the rules committees were adopted as follows:

That the Committee to Nominate Rules Committees should nominate hereafter for football, track, and basketball the several members divided into classes to serve one, two, three, or four years respectively. One whose term expires may be reelected for a term of four years. The chairman and the secretary or editor of each committee, however, are to be elected annually.

That the same committee put on the rules committees of five sports, representatives of secondary school organizations as advisory members without vote.

The following new members were elected to the Association:

Active Members:

- University of Oregon
- University of Buffalo
- University of California
- Western State Teachers College
- St. Lawrence University
- Duquesne University
- Coast Guard Academy
- Colorado Agricultural College
- University of Utah
- Gettysburg College

Associate Member :

Rochester Athenaeum

Allied Membership :

Michigan Collegiate Conference

Ohio Collegiate Athletic Conference

Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Conference

Virginia Athletic Conference

Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association

Middle Atlantic States Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference

The Treasurer presented his report showing a balance on hand of \$8,164.54, which was accepted after an audit which was made by Professor Marshall.

The amendments to the Constitution which had been outlined in the call for the meeting were all adopted as follows :

Changes in the By-laws, recommended by the Executive Committee :

Article 2, Section 1. Add the sentence : "In the absence of the President, or in case he is incapacitated from serving, one of the vice-presidents to be chosen by him shall take his place and perform his duties."

Article 3. Add to Section 2 the following : "This committee shall represent the Council and act for them in the general conduct of the affairs of the Association not otherwise provided for in the Constitution and By-laws. It shall render a report of its proceedings to the Council on the day prior to the annual convention."

Changes in the Constitution recommended by a special committee consisting of the Secretary, Mr. Bingham of Harvard, and Dr. Kennedy of Princeton :

Add to Article 6, Section 2, of the Constitution : "Whenever the Association votes to take a formal ballot, either written or *viva voce*, on any question, the names of the delegates as they vote will be checked by the Committee on Credentials in order to verify the authority of the voter. Only accredited and not visiting delegates may vote, and not more than three representatives of either an active or an allied member may share in a proportional vote as defined in the preceding paragraph. Voting by proxy is not allowed. The same delegate may represent both an active and an allied member (that is, a college and a conference) on presenting proper credentials."

Change Article 6 of the By-laws by adding the following :

(2) Appointment of a Committee on Credentials. (The following numbers to be changed accordingly.)

Dean Sanford gave an outline of his district report which was not printed in advance but which will be found in full in these Proceedings. He also reported for a committee appointed last year to consider recommendations and suggestions for the coördination of all the agencies in the fostering of proper athletic ideals and in the correction of outstanding evils. In view of the recent report of the Carnegie Foundation his committee recommended that they be given another year to consider the subject, and it was voted to accept the report as a report of progress.

Following is the report of a special Committee on the Carnegie Report:

Your committee recommends that the National Collegiate Athletic Association call to the attention of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching the appreciation of the Association because of the recent report of the Foundation on American college athletics. The comprehensiveness of the report, the spirit that motivated the gathering of information and analysis of evidence assembled, and the presentation of conclusions make of it a unique contribution to the history and better understanding of college athletics.

Your committee recommends that the Association urge upon college and university presidents and upon the authorities in secondary schools, the importance of familiarizing themselves with the contents of this report and bringing it to the understanding attention of trustees, faculties, and alumni, particularly to those whose responsibilities or interests relate them more directly to athletics and the welfare of students. Your committee is of the opinion that every educational official with responsibilities in or related to athletics should analyze his own institution in the light of this report and make earnest, quiet effort to use it for the benefit of his own school, college, or university.

Finally, your committee recommends that a sub-committee of the Council be appointed to study this report, and set up a practical and promising plan for its further use by all member institutions of this Association.

THOMAS A. STOREY,

Chairman.

General Pierce reported on the negotiations with the Amateur Athletic Union and the American Olympic Association. It was voted that the Secretary should express to the Olympic Association the appreciation of our organization for the courteous treatment received in the recent conference. These two reports will be found in the Appendix.

A communication was received from Mr. D. J. Ferris, Secretary of the Amateur Athletic Union, stating that his Executive Committee had requested him to request the N. C. A. A. to

appoint a special committee or committees to confer with a similar committee or committees of the A. A. U. and such other organizations as may be deemed wise and pertinent, for the purpose of unifying all rules, and especially those of the games on the Olympic program. He added that his organization had in mind particularly at this time the rules for wrestling and water polo. It was agreed by the Association to appoint such a committee, and that the Executive Committee should attend to the matter.

The Committee on Nominating Rules Committees made the following report, with the understanding that the classification of certain members as to years of service should be in the hands of the Council. This Nominating Committee was made up representatives of districts as follows:

(1) J. M. Cates, Yale; (2) J. E. Raycroft, Princeton; (3) L. E. Glenn, Vanderbilt; (4) J. L. Griffith, Western Conference; (5) C. L. Brewer, University of Wisconsin; (6) D. A. Penick, University of Texas; (7) H. L. Marshall, University of Utah; (8) W. R. LaPorte, University of Southern California; S. W. Beyer, Iowa State College, Chairman.

RULES COMMITTEES FOR 1930

For football, basketball, and track rules the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 before the name of a member of a committee indicate that the individual in question is to serve one, two, three, or four years, beginning this year.

Association Football Rules

J. B. Thayer, University of Pennsylvania; A. W. Marsh, Amherst College; Thomas J. Dent, Dartmouth College; H. W. Clark, Harvard University; Nicholas Bawlf, Cornell University.

Advisory Committee: G. B. Affleck, International Y. M. C. A. College; A. S. Cookman, Haverford College; S. C. Staley, University of Illinois; J. S. Martin, Princeton University; H. J. Huff, University of Kansas; H. W. Maloney, Stanford University; Douglas Stewart, University of Pennsylvania.

Baseball Rules

Edgar Fauver, Wesleyan University; J. H. Nichols, Oberlin College; Curry Hicks, Mass. Agricultural College; R. L. Fisher, University of Michigan; C. L. Lundgren, University of Illinois.

Basket Ball Rules

L. W. St. John, Ohio State University, Chairman; Oswald Tower, Andover Academy, Editor; (1) W. E. Meanwell, 4th dis-

trict; E. L. Roberts, 7th district; (2) Ralph Morgan, 2nd district; J. F. Bohler, 8th district; (3) W. McK. Barber, 1st district; C. L. Brewer, 5th district; (4) George Tebell, 3rd district; F. A. Schmidt, 6th district.

Boxing Rules

R. T. McKenzie, University of Pennsylvania; Thomas Mills, University of Notre Dame; Lt. Com. O. O. Kessing, U. S. Naval Academy; Forest Fletcher, Washington and Lee University; Lt. H. M. Monroe, U. S. Military Academy.

Football Rules

E. K. Hall, 195 Broadway, New York City, Chairman; W. S. Langford, 80 Maiden Lane, New York City, Member at large; (1) W. W. Roper, 2nd district; H. W. Hughes, 7th district; (2) T. A. D. Jones, 1st district; M. F. Ahearn, 5th district; (3) H. J. Stegeman, 3rd district; A. A. Stagg, 4th district; (4) Ray Morrison, 6th district; W. O. Hunter, 8th district.

Gymnastic Rules

C. W. Graydon, 160-10 Sanford Ave., Flushing, N. Y.; P. M. Clark, U. S. Naval Academy; Christopher Beling, 711 West 171st St., New York City;

Advisory Committee: Roy Moore, New York University; O. L. Hoffer, University of Chicago; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; Harry Maloney, Stanford University.

Ice Hockey Rules

Albert I. Prettyman, Hamilton College; E. L. Bigelow, Harvard University; Clare Peacock, Princeton University; E. E. Wieman, University of Michigan; R. J. Trimble, Columbia University.

Advisory Committee: F. A. Haist, Cornell University; Emil Iverson, University of Minnesota; T. J. Lieb, University of Wisconsin; Edward Lowry, University of Michigan; L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College; L. M. Noble, Yale University; Rev. F. H. Sill, Kent School; Joseph Stubbs, Harvard University.

Lacrosse Rules

L. J. Korn, Swarthmore College; Roy Taylor, Cornell University; C. P. Collins, 432 Main St., Stamford, Conn; R. V. Truitt, University of Maryland; V. Starzenski, 1038 Park Ave., Schenectady, N. Y.; Charles Marsters, Harvard University; J. B. Crenshaw, Georgia School of Technology; L. D. Cox, Syracuse University.

Swimming Rules

F. W. Luehring, University of Minnesota; E. T. Kennedy, Columbia University; A. E. Eilers, Washington University (St. Louis); R. J. H. Kiphuth, Yale University; Ernest Brandsten, Stanford University.

Advisory Committee: G. C. Hazelton, Dartmouth College; Allen Gosnell, Princeton University; M. Mann, University of Michigan; A. H. Armstrong, Georgia School of Technology; Henry Ortland, U. S. Naval Academy; Roy Henderson, University of Texas; J. H. Mason, University of Colorado.

Track Rules

T. N. Metcalf, Iowa State College, Chairman; E. A. Thomas, High School Federation; (1) C. W. Kennedy, 2nd district; J. L. Griffith, 4th district; (2) Henry Schulte, 5th district; O. S. Edmondson, 8th district; (3) A. C. Gilbert, 1st district; Clyde Littlefield, 6th district; (4) R. A. Fetzer, 3rd district; Creed Haymond, 7th district.

Volley Ball Rules

J. H. McCurdy, International Y. M. C. A. College; W. A. Kearns, San Diego, California; S. C. Staley, University of Illinois.

Wrestling Rules

R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska; J. A. Rockwell, Mass. Institute of Technology; Walter O'Connell, Cornell University; C. P. Miles, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; G. M. Trautman, Ohio State University; D. B. Swingle, Montana State College.

Advisory Committee: C. J. Gallagher, Harvard University; D. B. Sinclair, Princeton University; Richard Barker, Cornell College; M. C. Gallagher, Oklahoma A. and M. College; R. J. McLean, University of Texas; J. G. Arbuthnot, University of Washington; Major H. M. Read, Virginia Military Institute.

The Secretary was asked to write a letter to Mr. Howard Reiter in appreciation of the service he has given to the Association, and expressing the hope of his early return to active life.

The Committee to Nominate Officers which had been serving during the year was constituted as follows: Professor T. A. Storey, Chairman, Stanford University; Professor F. W. Marvel, Brown University; Mr. E. P. Cousins, University of Pennsylvania (died during the year); Professor M. J. White, Tulane University; Professor O. F. Long, Northwestern University; Dr. R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska; Dean C. E. Friley, A. & M. College of Texas; Professor S. L. MacDonald, Colorado Agricultural College. The committee, through the chairman, made the following report:

Your Committee on Nominations is deeply impressed by the significance of the problem that confronts the Committee this year. The desire of General Pierce to be relieved of the burden of his office, carried by him through so many years of unselfish and successful service, brings us not only a serious responsibility in the nomination of his successor, but also an opportunity to recognize, even though inadequately, this high service of General Pierce.

We therefore recommend that this association direct its Council to take such steps as may be necessary to create the office of Honorary President and that Brigadier General Palmer E. Pierce be elected permanently to that position in this association. Our other nominations are:

President: Dr. C. W. Kennedy, Princeton University.

Secretary-Treasurer: Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.

Vice-Presidents:

First District, Mr. W. S. Langford, Trinity College (Since the convention Mr. Langford has resigned and the Executive Committee has appointed Professor A. W. Marsh

college athletics, and said that it was his opinion that the Association should keep in close touch with them in all matters affecting the good of college sport. He remarked that he felt there was a greater future than ever before the N. C. A. A. and that the problem was how to make its influence felt all through the year instead of merely at the time of the convention. He was of the opinion that this was the strongest national governing body of sports in the country and that our code had much to do with that of other sports governing bodies. He hoped for a continued record of strong and useful influence for our Association, and pledged his best efforts toward that end.

Dean Sanford, of the University of Georgia, spoke in the highest terms of the work accomplished by General Pierce, and moved the appointment by the president of a committee to draw up resolutions expressing the appreciation by the Association of General Pierce's services, these resolutions to be sent to him and to be published in the press and in the Proceedings. That motion was adopted, and the President of the Association appointed a committee, Dr. Sanford, Dr. Raycroft, and Dean Nicolson, who have prepared the following resolution, which will be offered for adoption at the next Convention:

Therefore the colleges and universities owe a great debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts in behalf of college sports, for it is largely through his perseverance and common sense that many of the vexing problems of intercollegiate sports have been solved for college executives and college faculties. He ever emphasized "that every little we can do to make clean our college sports will help our citizens to make cleaner the greater games of national life; for clean sports make honest men".

For many years General Pierce represented in the American Olympic Association a nation-wide college constituency interested in placing America's participation in the Olympic games upon the highest level of amateurism, sportsmanship, and representation of national life and spirit. In all the deliberations and the decisions of the Olympic Association his voice was constantly lifted, and his influence unwaveringly exerted, for an administration of American Olympic interests truly amateur, democratic, and patriotic.

In his personal relations General Pierce is a gentleman of rare charm, whom men respect and love to follow. To measure his greatness, one must measure around his heart; for he is a most lovable and manly character. As a presiding officer he was firm but gentle, frank in all his statements but considerate of the opinions of others; dignified, courteous, fair. He has wisdom, which is common sense in an uncommon degree, ripe judgment and the wise prudence that can only come with experience,

General Pierce, amid great applause, expressed his appreciation of the attitude of the Association toward his retirement, and told of the pleasure he had enjoyed in doing the work which he had done for the Association. He added that he was always ready to do everything he could for its best interests, and the hope was expressed by President Kennedy that he would be with us on later occasions to guide us with his counsel and advice.

The meeting then adjourned.

FRANK W. NICOLSON,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF DISTRICTS

FIRST DISTRICT

PROFESSOR GEORGE H. NETTLETON, YALE UNIVERSITY

This report aims to present (1) some characteristic present aspects of college athletics in the group of New England colleges and (2) some reflection of opinion within the group on the facts and findings of the recent Carnegie Report on "American College Athletics". To secure a fair consensus of opinion, the presidents of all member institutions in the First District of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were invited to give either personally or through accredited representatives their views on these questions. Without abusing the courtesy and the confidence of individual responses, and with clear recognition of their wide range and diversity, it seems possible to suggest some general conclusions.

Broadly speaking, the New England group of colleges has unity in its diversity. Factors in this general solidarity are the common background of long academic history and tradition, the close restriction of geographical area, and the gradual development of athletics in natural accord with local conditions. These local factors remain dominant in the New England situation, despite some evident influences of intersectional athletics. The numerous traditional athletic inter-relations within the New England college group are matters of common knowledge. Along with such generally stabilizing influences there should be recognized clearly an individuality and independence of action alien to rigid standardization of athletic policy and practice. Thus the Association of New England Colleges has found its most acceptable service as a clearing-house of opinion rather than as a final legislative court. It can and does helpfully accentuate the common concerns of its constituents, but it cannot formulate a mandatory code of common law. Notwithstanding many factors of difference operating within the group, the separate reports of New England colleges reflect a general solidarity of aim and action.

In this broad kinship of athletic spirit, the greatest common factor within the group is the development of general student participation in athletics. The familiar terms "mass athletics" and "athletics for all" cannot be dismissed as plausible catch-words or as smoke-screens for intercollegiate contests. In the decade since the War, not merely the statistics of largely increased numbers and proportion of students participating in athletics, but the tangible facts of enlarged playing fields and general athletic facilities prove that is a condition and not a

theory that now happily confronts us. Tennis courts and golf courses, squash and squash racket courts, swimming pools and soccer fields have notably multiplied. These serve preponderantly the recreational needs of the student-body as a whole. New gymnasiums, variously reported as recently completed, in process of construction, or in immediate prospect, and other buildings for indoor sports and exercise have greatly enlarged practical facilities for individual physical development. Furthermore, no brief summary can do proper justice to the rapid progress of the various university and college departments of health, with their manifold and correlated activities.

The growth of intramural team competitions, as well as of facilities for individual physical development, is likewise significant. This is conspicuous both in the so-called "major sports", and in the greatly increased range and variety of "minor sports". Class, dormitory, and fraternity teams of many sorts are encouraged for their own sake, and give recreation and the zest of competition to hundreds who neither seek nor expect promotion to varsity teams. Indeed, the rapid development of informal sport has not simply altered the proportions between the numbers engaged respectively in intercollegiate and in intramural athletics, but has sometimes directly affected the popularity even of a "major sport" itself. College baseball has certainly been thus affected by tennis and golf. It is wholly natural, then, that the present reports of the New England colleges unite in manifold proofs of a single, centralizing factor—the demonstrable development of general student participation in athletics and of tangible facilities to meet the demands.

While the facts and figures of the programs of physical expansion of playing fields, gymnasiums, and like facilities for general exercise and recreation are especially impressive in the cases of the larger institutions, the trend of the times finds more direct personal interpretation in some of the representative comments from the smaller colleges. Thus one college president says: "We have had during the year a distinct turn towards the forms of athletic sports which represent pleasure for the individual rather than a sacrifice for the college. We had an excellent basketball team last year and a good baseball team, but the students are thinking more of the games they play themselves for enjoyment." Another college reports "a distinct tendency to shorten the schedules in some sports, as far as the number of game is concerned. This is being done with premeditation, for two reasons,—first, because of the expense involved, and, secondly, because the students do not seem to desire long schedules in certain sports." A third college says: "We have introduced soccer football as a sport for the first time and an informal team has played several games. This sport gives promise of becoming very popular. It has also served to increase

the number of men participating in intramural and intercollegiate games this term. About 70% of our men students have been regularly engaged in some field sport this season."

The universities and larger colleges give further testimony of similar general purport. The president of one large college recognizes "no significant athletic development during the past year beyond the enlarging of facilities constantly for our recreational work and the carrying on of the development of our system of intramural sports, supplementing a greater diversity of sports in which so-called 'varsity' teams are being developed." A university president writes: "We are laying continually renewed emphasis upon intramural athletics in order to secure increased participation in competitive group exercise."

It suits neither the limits of this report nor its main aim of coördinating individual comments towards fairly representative general conclusions, to include discussion of various temporary or local aspects of college athletics. Intercollegiate football, often the main point of athletic debate, receives little special comment in the responses received, but one college president expresses his judgment that "the present development of the game is better suited to the large universities than to small colleges." Various comments stressing the continuity of tenure of office of athletic coaches, the prevalent cordiality of intercollegiate athletic relations, and the usually reasonable and commendable undergraduate attitude toward athletic sports may fairly be taken as mainly characteristic of the New England group as a whole.

The recent publication of Bulletin No. 23—"American College Athletics"—of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has attracted the general interest of press and public as well as the particular interest of the colleges. The responses of the New England group of colleges show clear sympathy with the underlying purpose of the Carnegie study, and cordial and full coöperation during its progress. One college representative notes that "since this investigation was made at the request of the members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, by vote at an annual meeting, they should correct the impression that is now held by many people, that the Carnegie Foundation made this survey upon their own initiative and that it was therefore an intrusion upon the privacy of the colleges visited."

It is fair to emphasize a clear distinction between the actual content of the Report itself and various misleading impressions and hasty inferences drawn from exaggerated journalistic headlines and comments on the early press summaries of the Report. It is equally fair to note some definite expressions of regret as to the chosen methods of publicity. One president whose college is given, in the current phrase, "a clean bill of health," writes; "I think the Foundation made a great mistake in not submitting

the report to the different colleges before it was given to the press." Another similarly unbiased comment suggests that "both the Report and various institutions involved suffered unduly from the very exaggeration and over-emphasis of newspaper athletic commentary so fully sensed in a special chapter of the Report." Here, as elsewhere repeatedly, it is gratifying to note that institutions favorably listed in the Report are especially mindful of the dangers of popular misinterpretation and the consequent need of fully safeguarding interests other than their own.

Opinions on the accuracy and adequacy of the published Report, and of its present and probable later effects vary considerably. Definite illustration of their range and variety may be given.

"Bulletin No. 23 appears to be the first unbiased and impartial report given on intercollegiate athletics. Whether the benefits to be derived will be sufficient to justify the great amount of work entailed will probably never be known. We believe, however, that college executives, and those interested in this great phase of college life, will welcome this text book for reference in helping to solve the many problems connected with athletics."

"There is some difference of opinion as to the value of the Carnegie report, but the criticism has been chiefly directed at the method of handling the material obtained on the subsidizing of athletes. A study of the complete report has impressed many of us that it is by far the most valuable analysis of the exaggerated position occupied by intercollegiate athletics in our colleges. It has been most valuable in stressing the value of well organized intramural sports which should be carried on with a fair degree of the thoroughness now shown in the varsity sports. As with most forward looking reports the individual institutions may close their eyes and stagger along, or they may find in such a report valuable suggestions for the development of a program of physical education more in keeping with their theories of education."

"So far as the accuracy and adequacy of the Carnegie report are concerned, I believe that it is probably in most respects an under-statement. I doubt, however, if it will have very much influence on college athletics, since its main features were pretty generally known heretofore."

"I am not particularly impressed with the essential accuracy of the report. For example, it is to me of no significance that [the writer's institution] and _____ are on the 'pure list', while _____ and _____ are regarded as under a cloud. On the other hand, I think the report has called attention to some important matters and has already done good. It will do more."

"The Carnegie report placed this college in the small group not criticised for its practices. I suppose it does not, therefore, become us to make comment upon their findings I was

very favorably impressed by the thoroughness and fairness with which the Carnegie representative conducted his investigation at this college. The Carnegie Foundation was, I believe, asked to conduct this survey because their findings would not be biased or open to question. Athletics had been severely criticised by many agencies, and we wanted the facts. I believe that we now have them, and it is most unwise to attempt to discount them by ridicule. There is much in the body of this report beside the much quoted Chapter Ten which is valuable to those who desire to have college athletics contribute to the general development of all students."

"The report, in my belief, represents to a maximum degree the infelicity of investigations by people presumably with research ability but with little knowledge of the field in which they are investigating. There were given full access to any files or data which we had, and in general we did not attempt to interpret these to them, supposing them to be capable of interpreting them themselves. The results showed our assumptions to be largely wrong So far as ——— is concerned, the data given are inaccurately reported, fallacious deductions are made on the basis of partial data considered, and the findings were unbelievably in error. I think that a report could have been drawn which would have been helpful and useful—and I do not mean by this that it would have been in any sense a white-washing report—but I do not think that this report is helpful, and I think in regard to other institutions about whose affairs I have some knowledge that the report is misleading and unjust."

"As to one's opinion regarding the Carnegie Report, I think its accuracy is unquestioned; I am inclined to think that in case of some institutions, it has been over-severe. It is, of course, clear that this Report gives no data, as undoubtedly it could not, about one feature of college athletics that is sometimes criticised,—the alumnus who pays the way of a boy through school or college, in whole or part, at least partially because he believes the boy is a potential athlete. In some cases I think this practice leads to grave abuses; in others, it is, of course, simply a part of a larger effort by older men to assist younger men to get an education."

"We are in correspondence with the Carnegie Foundation to ascertain from the Foundation the details of the information upon which the Report as pertaining to ——— was based. We have been met in the spirit of cooperation, and we are making a careful study of conditions here, relative to the points raised in the Report so far as it pertains to the conduct of athletics [here]. When the study under the auspices of our Athletic Council is completed we expect to issue a statement of our findings. Until such time it seems to me that a reply to your question would be unwarranted and premature. With the

general purpose of the Report of the Carnegie Foundation we are in entire accord."

Though written reports from all institutions in the First District are not available at the date when this report has to be submitted, the material quoted or in hand seems sufficiently illustrative of opinion within the group. This opinion ranges too widely to fit any close formula. Obviously, however, Chapter X of the Report—"The Recruiting and Subsidizing of Athletes"—has become the central point of discussion. It is neither fair nor feasible to review here individual findings, but there is evidence of considerable feeling that the sense of just proportion and perspective has been disturbed, to the detriment of various institutions. One constructive comment, developed, it may be remarked, among representatives of institutions favorably listed in the Report, would probably commend itself widely within the whole New England group. This suggests, in effect, that in the organization of material in Chapter X clearer differentiation between major and minor abuses might have been readily effected, and that minor practices, possibly open to objection but not necessarily indicative of serious abuse, and sometimes actually in process of correction, would thus have been more properly subordinated both in general press publicity and popular opinion. At all events, it may well be said that the New England group of colleges has shown generous appreciation of the purpose of the Carnegie study, active coöperation with its processes of investigation, and a prevalent disposition to examine its conclusions carefully, and to utilize them, so far as they commend themselves as sound and constructive, as one means towards the common end of betterment of college athletics.

SECOND DISTRICT

DR. CHARLES W. KENNEDY, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The fact of outstanding importance in the sphere of intercollegiate athletics during the past year was the publication of the careful study of intercollegiate sport on which the Carnegie Foundation had been engaged for a period of about three years. In view of the detailed discussion of intercollegiate sport contained in that Report, and the care and objective fairness with which the material was presented, it would seem that in one sense there is less reason for the separate reports from the various districts of the National Collegiate Athletic Association this year than ever before. I have, however, during the past autumn requested from the presidents and athletic directors of the colleges and universities located in the Second District information, in such detail as they might care to give, as to the general condi-

tion of sport at their institutions, and in particular as to any outstanding problems or new developments which might have arisen during the past year. One or two points stand out as of chief interest in the material gathered through the coöperation of these college officers.

Perhaps the greatest significance of the reports from the colleges and universities of the Second District is to be found in the many references in these reports to the increasing development of a more comprehensive athletic program by the expansion of athletic facilities and the provision of opportunities for competition in intramural games by constantly increasing numbers of undergraduates. This is of course no new ideal in college sport. It may indeed be considered the ideal most generally in the minds of college athletic administrators since the resumption of college sport after the war. During this period at Princeton, for example, the fostering of such an intramural program has been constantly advanced by the harmonious coöperation of the Athletic Association and the department of physical education.

During the past year there have been many illustrations in this district of attempts to develop a more general athletic program of undergraduate participation in sport, and it is interesting to note that these efforts have taken various forms and employed various devices. From Syracuse University, Chancellor Flint writes of a reorganization now under way in the control and supervision of athletic sports, which will probably result in "a single organization to cover both intramural and intercollegiate sports, with the emphasis very decidedly on the former. This is to counteract the difficulty of too great emphasis on intercollegiate sports and the turning out of winning teams and neglect of the all-round athletic program."

At other institutions in this district more general student participation in sport on an informal basis is being sought through more careful and detailed organization of a program of intramural competition. The statement of Mr. Ristine, Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Undergraduate Activities at Hamilton College, applies equally well to developments which are being carried forward along generally similar lines at a number of other colleges. He says: "Perhaps the most satisfactory recent development in this department has been the cultivation of interclass competition. The physical directors conduct an elaborate system of interclass games throughout the year in each of the ten sports in which we maintain varsity teams. Each class team plays every other class team, and in each sport. The different sports are given arbitrary ratings according to their relative importance, and at the end of the year the winning class is determined on the basis of points won. This system is now in its second year and is thought to have passed the experimental stage. It attracts no headlines, and many of the faculty even are doubtfully aware of

its existence. But the undergraduates give it natural and normal support, and it has done much toward supplying athletic competition for those men who are not varsity material."

The report from Cornell University also shows that during the past year the principal administrative activity has had to do with facilities for more general enjoyment of sport by the undergraduate body as a whole. Mr. Romeyn Berry, Graduate Manager at Cornell, writes: "The principal activity in the year just passed at Cornell has had to do with the development of Beebe Lake on the campus for general winter sports and for swimming and boating in the spring and summer. This pond of 25 acres is being dredged to a uniform depth of 12 feet and is expected to furnish an ideal location for the participation of all students in skating, hockey, tobogganing, skiing, swimming, and the like. A new toboggan house has been constructed which provides a storage capacity of 1,500 toboggans, with a rest room, office, and work shop. The operation of the lake will also provide unusually attractive facilities for outdoor swimming. At the present time it is not infrequent to have 4,000 people skating on a good Saturday afternoon, and 1,500 swimming on a warm June day."

An unusually large number of students are candidates for the various teams that represent the University of Pennsylvania in intercollegiate competition. For the academic year of 1928-29, there were 4,401 students eligible for such competition. Of these 1,109 men are engaged in competitive sports, either as members of or candidates for the various teams. 1,375 men are engaged in intramural athletics and 1,169 take gymnasium work. In addition 647 men are excused from taking gymnasium or intramural work or competitive athletics, because of service in the R. O. T. C., physical disability, etc.

It is interesting and heartening, then, to note from the foregoing reports, and others of a similar nature, an increasing belief on the part of the athletic administrators of this district that college sport should be so organized and administered as to bring the benefits inherent in it to the entire student body, and not to the few only that represent the college upon intercollegiate teams. It seems also significant that in the cases I have cited this objective is being sought by such diverse methods as a change in administrative control, an expansion of physical equipment, and the development of an extended program of interclass competition.

There has been in recent years increasingly widespread and increasingly adverse comment upon the extent to which college sports are directed or influenced during the playing periods of games by the coach. It is becoming generally recognized that one of the greatest benefits that can come to an undergraduate from participation in sport is the development of initiative, resource-

fulness, and self-dependence in meeting and solving the various problems which arise in the course of an athletic contest. Much of the criticism of the coaches' influence upon the actual playing of a contest has been directed against football. There are doubtless instances in this sport in which such criticism is deserved. But it is an extraordinary fact that there has been much less criticism of this practice in the case of another sport where the influence of the coach upon the game can be far more dominant and controlling, namely, in baseball. It has for years been the practice of many coaches of college baseball teams to give signals from the bench directing the batting of their team. Within the recent past instances have come under my observation in which the coach not only gives signals when his men are at bat, but also signals what ball the pitcher shall throw when his team is in the field. I know of no other sport in which it is possible for the coach to exert such a controlling influence upon the playing of a game as in the case of baseball under such a system of signals.

Believing this practice to be contrary to the best interests of the undergraduates engaged, and contrary to the best interests of the sport itself, in June, 1929, Princeton, through her representatives on the executive committee of the Eastern Intercollegiate Baseball League, invited the other members of the league to play their league baseball games with Princeton with the coach off the bench, and with no communication, direct or indirect, between him and the members of the team during the course of the game. It is a pleasure to report that this invitation has been accepted by Columbia and Yale Universities, and that Princeton, Yale, and Columbia have entered into an informal memorandum of agreement designed to restore the direction of their baseball games during the playing periods to the sole control of the undergraduate captain.

It is to be hoped that, with this beginning, other members of the league may see their way to play their baseball games with one another under these same conditions, and that from this beginning may develop, in baseball at least, a restoration of the game into the hands of the undergraduate players.

One of the most heartening elements in the reports received from member institutions in this district was the expression of attitude on the part of presidents and administrative officers generally toward the recently published Carnegie Report. It should be stated, however, that at this time of writing thirteen out of forty-three members of the N. C. A. A. in the Second District have not reported. Some differences of opinion have naturally developed regarding the Carnegie study, in certain instances doubt being expressed as to whether the representatives of the Carnegie Foundation had been successful in establishing all the facts. In the case of Fordham University, the report of Dean Charles J. Beane contains a severe and detailed arraign-

ment of the report. "I believe", he writes, "that Fordham should make a formal protest to the N. C. A. A. on the Report of the Carnegie Foundation As a member of the N. C. A. A. Fordham has not only a right, but a duty, to protest the treatment it has received, and such protest will be made at the proper time to the N. C. A. A."

With few exceptions, however, the reports received from member institutions in this district were similar in one most important respect, namely, in the expression of a belief that the publication of the Carnegie Report has been a notable contribution to the best interests of college sport, and that the influence of the Report will be a continuing and growing influence in proportion to a general recognition of the significant question it raises as to "what steps will be taken by the institutions concerned in correcting the conditions which have been pointed out."

"I hope," writes President Richards of Lehigh, "that the Report will have such a profound effect on those interested in higher education that those responsible for the existing conditions in athletics will be led to effect reforms which will more definitely put athletics in their proper place in the scheme of higher education, and that the pernicious influences prostituting the ethical standards of youth which have prevailed in the past in so many institutions may be wiped out."

THIRD DISTRICT

DEAN S. V. SANFORD, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

The colleges and universities of the third district, including the states of Maryland and Louisiana, have gone through a year of healthy competition and improved relationships. So far as I have been able to ascertain there have been no instances of disagreement between colleges which have resulted in the severance of athletic relations, and no unsportsmanlike conduct to mar the contests on the gridiron. The relation between the coaches is satisfactory and cordial. I have a very definite impression that the atmosphere surrounding our college sports is most gratifying.

The conditions in this district and in every other district are by no means ideal, but the fact that there has been steady improvement in all directions during the past ten years is, to express it mildly, very encouraging. I am inclined to think that those who are discouraged over college sports, or who have become outright antagonistic because of real or imaginary conditions, have gained their impressions by taking into consideration too small an arc of the cycle of events.

Athletic Conferences

The great single cause of advancement in the conduct and control of college sports and intercollegiate athletics has been the regional athletic conferences. The regional conferences, unlike the National Collegiate Athletic Association from which all athletic conferences have sprung, are regulatory and mandatory. These athletic conferences consist, in large measure, of institutions athletically and scholastically related. All institutions should belong to some athletic conference, and conferences should be formed on the basis of territory, of size, of traditional rivalry, and like factors.

Recently there has been a tendency to minimize the work of athletic conferences, and to undervalue the work of the faculty men who have been largely responsible for the supervision and control of college sports. With organization has come the almost universal adoption of the one-year rule, the migrant rule, the three-year limit of participation, the elimination of the special student, the uniform entrance requirement of fifteen units together with many other rules tending towards uniformity. That it has required patience, courage, vision to bring these rules and regulations into operation, no one familiar with the history of intercollegiate sports can doubt.

All athletic conferences in this district have contributed their part in bringing order out of chaos and in attempting to keep college sports on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education. I doubt seriously if any phase of college life or interest has seen greater development or greater improvement than has been the case with intercollegiate sports. President Alderman, University of Virginia, in reply to my letter of recent date inviting him to attend the annual meeting of the Southern Conference, wrote: "I appreciate very much indeed the fundamental things that have been accomplished under the pioneership of the Southern Conference. There are, perhaps, others yet to be done, some of which you mention. I am confident you will bring them up, and that they will receive satisfactory discussion and decision." I think I am correct in saying that this is the attitude of the executives of the twenty-three Conference institutions, and there is no tendency among them to minimize the fundamental things that have been accomplished.

It is true that "abuses can not be cured by legislation—by athletic conferences", but they have been greatly reduced. It would be far better if we could have the coöperation of all coördinating agencies. Those familiar with college sports can not say that the technical rules are not enforced in letter and in spirit. Progress has been slow but sure. In the Southern Conference, for example, it has required years to define certain words—*college*, *intercollegiate contest*, *intercollegiate participation*. There was honest difference of opinion as to the meaning of these terms.

There had to be this period of technical by-laws, regulations, interpretations, before this or any other conference could make much progress in dealing with the intricate problems which are, in large measure, not within the complete province of athletic conferences.

At the meeting of the executive committee of the Southern Conference, last September, it was agreed that an urgent invitation be sent to all the presidents of the institutions concerned asking them to attend the annual meeting, December 13 and 14, at Baton Rouge. The gist of my letter to the presidents may be expressed in these few words:—"As I see the matter, the Southern Conference has about accomplished its mission so far as concerns the making and enforcement of technical rules. It can now go but little further without the active coöperation of all the college presidents concerned. Furthermore, the Southern Association of Colleges has definitely assigned such action to those directly concerned with athletics, and if you desire to have the Southern Conference function as an aid in the control of inter-collegiate athletics and college sports, then we feel that it is the duty of the presidents of the institution involved to accept this urgent and cordial invitation". The number accepting the invitation was indeed encouraging. Not lack of interest, but important engagements or sickness made it impossible for some to be present.

The objectives set forth in my letter and repeated in my annual message were: (a) uniform academic requirements for participation in intercollegiate sports after the student enters college; (b) athletic scholarships, assignment of scholarships, and remunerative employment to students; and (c) the reducing of the number of football games to eight. The presidents and deans took an active part in the deliberations of the meeting and expressed a willingness and an eagerness to coöperate fully in solving the more intricate problems of college sports. A committee consisting of President Denny, University of Alabama, President Tigert, University of Florida, and President Dinwiddie, Tulane University, was appointed to make a report on these objectives at the next annual meeting or sooner, if possible, to the executive committee.

We believe the Southern Conference has made a great step forward in enlisting the active support and coöperation of the presidents of the institutions involved, and we confidently expect an easier and quicker solution of our problems, not only in the Conference but in the third district.

Athletic Scholarships

Assignment of scholarships and remunerative employment to students presents one of the most difficult and perplexing prob-

lems connected with college sports. Carnegie Bulletin 23 shows that among a majority of colleges and universities of this country inducements of various kinds were offered to athletes. Students on scholarships could be classed as follows: (a) those who are beneficiaries of scholarships, (b) those supported by alumni interested in the success of their universities, and (c) those paid by athletic associations or others interested in maintaining or building up the athletic prestige of one institution or another. Very few cases of the third type were found. It is most unfortunate that the Carnegie Committee in their summary of conditions from this viewpoint segregated heinous offenders as well as what may be termed mild offenders into one great class—the impure. However, if Bulletin 23 can help us solve the one embarrassing problem—athletic scholarships, we can overlook the injustice done here and there.

There are good scholarships and there are bad scholarships, and we must at all times differentiate between the two. No institution so far as I know is free from scholarships. I know there are those who say they have no scholarships, but they exist. The reason is that we have different conceptions of what constitutes scholarships. Until there is a uniform definition of the word *scholarship* and a uniform method of award, we shall have trouble and misunderstanding. The surreptitious scholarship must go, if we hope to keep athletics on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education. There will be no illegal scholarships of any kind, in my judgment, as soon as athletic conferences working in harmony with the presidents of the institutions concerned agree on what shall constitute a scholarship.

A uniform definition will solve the two most difficult and embarrassing problems—what constitutes a legal scholarship and what constitutes an illegal scholarship. Of course we all know what constitutes a surreptitious scholarship. To adopt a uniform method of award would be almost impossible, for who shall decide in any instance what is the controlling influence in the decision made by college authorities? This condition now applies to the award of scholarships to students for research work, for graduate work, for fellowships. We have all seen time and time again research scholarships awarded to men who did not deserve them, and whose subsequent work proved they were not entitled to the award any more than their previous work justified such consideration. How many times have we seen men of mediocre ability given a graduate scholarship over men of superior ability! Perhaps some day a committee will find the solution for the awarding of scholarships of all kinds—to athletes, to research works, to graduate students. If we can solve the problem of illegal scholarships, we can afford to wait until a more distant day to discuss other problems.

Scholastic Attainment

I believe the American people and members of the college faculties are firmly convinced that athletics have a place in our educational program. Our problem now is to coördinate this activity so as to present its right relation in the education of our young men. We all believe that scholastic attainment should be the firm aim of our educational institutions. We further believe that there should not be an overemphasis of the athletic side of college life and an underemphasis of the academic side. The remedy would seem to be not to reduce the emphasis on football and other college sports, but to emphasize the academic side. Here the college professors seem to be lacking. Perhaps it is true, as Dean Judd of the University of Chicago said recently in an address to the Southern Association of Colleges, that "the trouble is the lack of preparation of a large group of college teachers who have to be described as *unseasoned*, not to use a stronger term". We will admit that the professors know their particular subject well, but we must confess that they have little or no ability in imparting their knowledge or in inspiring their students with a love of learning. "There is a tradition in American colleges that a teacher's classroom is his castle. Many a teacher intrenched behind this tradition delivers half-prepared lectures or worse, and conducts recitations in a casual manner." Perhaps after all it is not intercollegiate sport that is breaking down the things intellectual—it may be unseasoned teachers, poor teaching, the lecture method of instruction, or the system of free electives. Certainly intercollegiate athletics alone are not responsible for the distortion of values intellectual or the pushing aside of scholarship. Let us not deny college sports either the consideration or the credit which is rightfully theirs.

General Survey

The attendance at college games this year showed a slight increase over previous years. Critics of football leave the impression that every football game is attended by crowds equal to those that attend a traditional game or some exceptional game played here and there. Even with the attendance as excellent as it is, it is difficult to secure the necessary funds to pay for coaching, for equipment, and for supporting all other forms of college sport—intercollegiate and intramural.

Officiating in this district has not been as satisfactory as it should have been. The officials this year seem to lay great stress on technical matters. If my information is correct, some were entirely too technical and others too liberal; they did not seem to strike the happy medium. Fortunately there were many well officiated games.

The Georgia School of Technology received the invitation to play in the Rose Bowl on New Year's Day. That institution defeated the University of California in a game that attracted the attention of the entire country. Three times members of the Southern Conference have been the opponents selected for the Tournament of Roses and three times have these invited guests been victorious. It merely indicates that football at the present time is played in one section as well as it is played in another.

Yale University did the University of Georgia the distinguished honor of sending its football team to dedicate the Georgia stadium. It was a gracious act on the part of Yale and that courtesy was appreciated not only by the people of Georgia but by the people of the South. No crowd so colorful ever witnessed a football game in this section of the country as at the Yale-Georgia dedication game, October 12. In passing it is well to record that here was an athletic contest of major interest in which money was not the consideration—only sentiment and courtesy.

Intercollegiate baseball, golf, boxing, lacrosse, tennis, track, cross country, swimming, and basketball are all carried on with reasonable interest and success. The basketball tournament in Atlanta every year still continues to grow in interest. Track is gaining in interest. This is a hopeful sign. Baseball is on the decline. There was less interest in this sport in this district than during any previous year.

The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Association held a very successful meeting at Mobile and passed a good deal of constructive legislation. There was much discussion prior to the meeting of a number of institutions withdrawing, but only two withdrew. This Association like the Southern Conference has a large number of members, but they are athletically and scholastically related. It is an excellent organization and is doing a great work in many respects. It is perhaps the oldest of all the athletic bodies in this district.

There are other athletic associations in this district, but I have no report upon which to base any statements worth while. From what little information I have been able to gather, they likewise are doing good work. All are making an honest endeavor to keep athletics on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education.

It was a very great pleasure to have the National Collegiate Athletic Association meet in New Orleans last December—in Southern Conference territory. We trust that this Association at no distant date will again meet in the third district. I feel certain that many of the delegates to this Association would some day like to meet with the University of Florida—at Jacksonville—the land of sunshine and flowers.

FOURTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR O. F. LONG, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Certain historical items may be mentioned by way of preface to this report. The Fourth District covers the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Within this territory are fourteen conferences, more or less formally associated groups, whose membership is determined by such factors as regional convenience, traditional rivalries, and educational ranking. The Intercollegiate Conference, or Big Ten, is historically and *de facto* the dominating group. The largest group comprises twenty-three colleges, the smallest four. The groups are usually delimited by state boundaries, but not wholly so, while in certain states there are several conferences. In Ohio, for example, there are now three local conferences and one member of the Intercollegiate Conference.

Not even the process of sub-dividing, or selective association, has produced a perfect harmony. On November 25 the Buckeye Athletic Association, a recently formed group comprising Miami, Ohio Wesleyan, Ohio University, University of Cincinnati, Denison, and Wittenberg, dropped Wittenberg. Whether this was by exclusion or resignation is immaterial. The basis, according to press reports, was the ever-recurring evil of proselyting, subsidizing, and forming an unsavory alliance with the merchants of the local town. Infractions of a similar nature led the Intercollegiate Conference last May to sever athletic relations with the University of Iowa. In this case documented evidence was presented by the Conference Athletic commissioner, and action was taken under a general regulation of the body which requires that "members of the Conference shall sever athletic relations with any member that does not conform in full to the Conference rules." It is reasonable to expect that after proper adjustments full and cordial relations will be restored. Meanwhile it is a fair assumption that one of the important results is a wholesome deterrent effect upon aggressive coaches and over-patriotic alumni groups. Of course exposure of evil invariably starts a chorus of pessimists, whereas prompt action of the character taken should hearten the optimists and even cause their tribe to increase. It has been pointed out repeatedly that the fostering of an effective public sentiment to support rules has always secured our best progress, but this progress is sometimes too slow for the impatient spirits who would remake human institutions overnight. President Ruthven, of the University of Michigan, voices this in his statement that "The cure for the present ills is not more rules, but education of the alumni and public generally in a saner attitude toward intercollegiate relations. Michigan and other universities are just at present in a transitional stage between worse conditions and better. We cannot deny the existence of collegiate

athletics nor the pressure from enthusiastic alumni and others, which is largely responsible for present conditions. This fad, we believe, is about to wane. But even at its height we do not think there is any justice in refusing to admit to the university an athlete because he is an athlete or in denying him the same sympathetic help in his studies that we want to give every student."

A study by the commissioner of the distribution of sports in the Intercollegiate Conference shows a wider participation by varsity teams in more forms of games year by year. Fifteen sports are now listed, with eight of them maintained by all members of the Conference. Swimming is provided for in nine of the ten institutions, while rowing is at the other extreme, being supported by Wisconsin alone.

Whatever may be true of the situation in more "emancipated" sections of the country, interest in athletics in the Fourth District shows no signs of waning. Approximately two million spectators witnessed the Intercollegiate Conference football games alone during the past season. The various "B" teams, formed to encourage a greater participation, have played their schedules again without attracting much attention from the public. It seems the part of wisdom to continue the experiment further, because this movement and the ambitious intramural programs at most of the institutions are very encouraging signs. In some cases from seventy-five to ninety per cent of the study body take part in intramurals.

This district was the first to make, or attempt to make, adequate provisions for the enormous student and public interest in basketball. Field houses planned even for twelve and fifteen thousand spectators will apparently still be undersize. From all reports interest in college baseball picked up slightly last season, but this sport does not seem likely to regain its lost place. On the other hand, the Intercollegiate Conference track meet of last June was in point of performance and of attendance one of the best in the history of the Conference.

Reports as to conditions in the other conferences of the district contain no outstanding features. The Mid-West Collegiate reports greater liberality in the treatment of junior college graduates, particularly relaxing in the requirement of a year's residence. The Wisconsin Intercollegiate has conducted through meetings held by its commissioner a definite propaganda for ideals announced in the preamble to their constitution. To quote: "We want our constituency and all others interested to recognize very definitely our stand and purpose in reference to athletics. We invite alumni and students to believe well, not only of their own institution, but also of the other institutions of the conference. If any evidence, or appearance of evidence, seems not to warrant this good faith, we have provided a way by which

matters may be brought to light and corrected. We have drawn up conference agreements, in the spirit and letter of them, and we have a commissioner who is the final arbiter. We believe there is no honest reason for any sort of mutual recriminations among the colleges under such an arrangement. The presidents of the colleges of this conference want definitely and clearly to declare themselves in point of emphasis, and in a way which the public can appreciate, that athletics have but a minor place, though a valuable place, in the college purpose. It is also clearly our conviction that the primacy in athletics is true sportsmanship rather than victory or defeat."

It cannot be urged too often that an essential factor in maintaining good sportsmanship in the conduct of games is to have officials of the highest type. The Intercollegiate Conference has reached a fortunate solution of this problem. The officials themselves maintain a very active organization that studies, discusses, and conducts examinations on the rules. There is thus a selective process to begin with. In certain sports, for example basketball, the commissioner alone appoints officials from a small approved list. For many years in football a conference committee of two together with the commissioner has made the appointments. Membership in this committee rotates, thus avoiding any suspicion of building up a favored following. At the beginning a rating by coaches was used as the basis for constituting a list of the most capable men. Provision was then made for systematic checking of their work, as well as of the conduct of coaches and the sportsmanship of the crowds. The list is thoroughly rechecked by the committee each year, the result being that a relatively small body of highly trained men is available. Annual meetings of this group are held with conference representatives. There is thus fostered a feeling of *esprit de corps*, and a sense of direct responsibility to the conference rather than a temptation to court the approval of any particular coach. Officials are assigned without regard to any hypothetical black list of coaches or stands. There has been the fullest coöperation on the part of the coaches, who feel chiefly a sense of relief from responsibility. The good results of this system have won favorable comments at home and in intersectional contests.

Having treated conditions thus far with hopefulness or candor, we may turn in closing to the Carnegie Report. The release of the Report was followed by some excitement, chiefly in press circles. It would be futile at this date to try to assess its ultimate effect in this district. The value of any survey depends fundamentally upon the accuracy of the picture drawn, and it is quite as incumbent to give the good side as well as the bad. A common remark has been that "The picture of our institution is very much out of focus." And surely in the case of important institutions that were visited for only a few hours, if visited at all,

the editors themselves would agree that the plate was under-exposed. One test of accuracy is quite simple. An investigation by the Intercollegiate Conference has led to drastic action in the case of the University of Iowa. The Carnegie field visitor apparently came and went in entire ignorance of the unfortunate conditions that necessitated the conference action. If the various phrases of the Report concerning the Intercollegiate Conference be weighed by the context, there are but two points for which the conference has been given unqualified credit. After thirty-five years of labor it appears that the conference (1) has dealt commendably with summer baseball (p. 205); (2) has made fruitful efforts to eliminate betting among undergraduates (p. 299). In the judgment of men who know the history of the conference, this total of credit errs on the ultra-conservative side.

FIFTH DISTRICT

DEAN S. W. BEYER, IOWA STATE COLLEGE

Athletic policies in the fifth district are in large measure determined by the two major intercollegiate conferences wholly within the district: the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association (the "Big Six"), and the Missouri Valley Conference, which continues to function. In addition to these organizations, there are a number of intra-state conferences and at least two interstate associations. One member of the Western Intercollegiate Conference (the "Big Ten") is located in the district. The rules and regulations governing intercollegiate athletic participation are very similar in all of these conferences. Both intra and interstate organizations recognize the importance of residence requirements and restrict participation to three or four years. The major conferences enforce the one year residence and the three year participation rules.

In their intercollegiate relations they are committed to the policy of so arranging their schedules that student absence from classes shall be reduced to a minimum. During the 1929 football season the "Big Six" found, in general, that trips required for games within the conference could be limited to one school day or less without any greater hardship to the visiting team than formerly when an additional day was used. The number of student-days thus saved per year is important.

The Capital Improvements Period, athletically, continues. Most of the colleges and universities in the district have completed their gymnasiums and stadiums, fairly adequate for the present. The field house stage has arrived. Almost every major institution

in the district is burdened with debt. This condition, apparently, is not a deterrent to further improvement, and building will continue as long as bond houses will furnish the money. Regents, trustees, and boards of education refuse to appropriate money for stadiums and field houses. The debts incurred must be met from gate receipts. Schedule making becomes a business enterprise. The "Big Business" atmosphere pervades our departments of physical education and athletics. Academic standards, educational ideals, and eligibility codes are difficult to maintain under these conditions.

Bulletin Number Twenty-Three of the Carnegie Foundation, long anticipated, appeared in October of this year. No one expected Dr. Savage and his assistants to discover and prescribe a "cure-all" for all of the ills, alleged and otherwise, of athletics. Dr. Savage is to be congratulated on his selection of material obtained by the fact finding survey. The records published are as accurate as could be expected, the discussions open-minded, and the inferences impartial. The chief value of the survey is in directing attention to certain irregularities, many of which may and should be corrected. Commercialized intercollegiate athletics is responsible for most of the evils. Recruiting through improper inducements is headlined in the report.

The question that now confronts the higher educational institutions in the fifth district is, What inducements are proper? The Western Conference attempted to answer the question, and after a survey put one member under discipline but did not publish their code. Are any or all of the following arrangements improper? Free scholarships? Remission of tuition and fees? Free tutoring for delinquent athletes? Jobs, big money, little or no work? Athletes carried by alumni or friends with or without contracts for service after graduation? Concessions with or without service? Loan funds?

One of the leading sports writers in the district contends that football players are entitled to board and room at the very least during the playing season. Few share his view, at least openly. A mid western college president states his views as follows: "That athletic participation should neither deter nor advance the ability of the student to get support from student loan funds or scholarship funds. The student's scholastic promise and his need should wholly determine this matter."

The Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association is studying the subsidizing and recruiting of athletes in the hope that a workable code may result.

SIXTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR D. A. PENICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Athletic Commission

More than a year ago, under the inspiration of a paper on Athletics in Texas Colleges, the Association of Texas Colleges appointed an Athletic Commission to have general oversight over athletic conditions in senior and junior colleges in Texas. The membership of the Commission consists of the presidents of these conference and the president and secretary of the association:

Association President, President L. H. Hubbard,
College of Industrial Arts, Denton.
Association Secretary-Treasurer, Dean W. S. Allen,
Baylor University, Waco.
President Southwest Athletic Conference, Professor D. A.
Penick, University of Texas, Austin.
President Texas Conference, Professor Thos. B. Simms,
Trinity University, Waxahachie.
President Texas Intercollegiate Athletic Association, Prof. D.
A. Shirley, West Texas State Teachers College, Canyon.
Presidents two Junior Colleges:
Professor D. E. Hawk, Jr., Lon Morris College, Jack-
sonville.
Professor I. R. McLemore, Hillsboro Junior College,
Hillsboro.

At the spring meeting of the Association last April, acting on instructions "to formulate policies governing its work", the commission, after pointing out the progress made in the control and guidance of athletics, indicated its purpose in the following recommendations:

(1) That in general the policy of your commission be (a) the securing of facts bearing on athletic conditions in all the conferences of your association, (b) the broadcasting of information relating to athletic conditions in colleges and secondary schools, (c) a concerted and constructive effort to study the problems of each conference and to bring the standard of each conference to a higher level and all closer together. In no sense should we be a fault-finding body, nor should we undertake to dictate to any conference or school in athletic matters. Such is the policy of the N. C. A. A. and the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges and to that policy we wish to adhere.

(2) More specifically we wish to recommend again and with emphasis that the management and control of athletics in every institution must be with the faculty which is primarily interested in athletics as a means to better scholarship and improved manhood. This does not mean merely that athletics must be taken

out of the hands of the student body but also that the interference of ex-students or of the local public or of the governing boards of our institutions is a real menace rather than a help. The only body that is in a position to handle the situation is the faculty and the whole athletic problem will be solved only as the faculty has a free hand and is fully awake to its responsibilities.

The opportunity to render this valuable service has just been presented to this commission by the action of the senior athletic conferences in Texas at their fall meetings in Dallas, December 9. All these conferences offered to cooperate with the Commission in a thoroughgoing investigation of athletic conditions in all Texas schools and most of the conference members met with the Commission at a dinner on the evening of December 9 for a full discussion of the problem before it and the proper plan of attacking it.

Every man present expressed not only a willingness, but an earnest desire to have a study made of conditions in his college. Some were pessimistic over present conditions and future prospects, others were optimistic about continued steady improvement for the future as there has been for the past several years. All rejoiced that the Carnegie Foundation Report found less to criticize in the sixth district than in many other sections. On the contrary, we know that the survey was not complete in our section, and we are therefore anxious to have a study made of athletics in every Texas college to the end that we who are clean may be so proclaimed and we who are unclean may become clean. All agreed that we need a restatement of amateurism, a definition of "faculty control", a new emphasis on honesty and frankness, insistence upon the enforcement of high scholastic standards, a revaluation of intercollegiate athletics and its proper place in our educational system. Not all were in full accord with either the findings or the standards of the Carnegie Foundation Report, but the Report has been a wonderful stimulus. Especially has it aroused from a state of lethargy a large number of administrative officers and faculty members who have been indifferent or critical without a knowledge of facts.

No one had a definite suggestion as to the best way of getting at the facts and many frankly doubted our ability to handle the situation entirely to our satisfaction in view of the impossibility of muzzling an irresponsible public. In spite of this doubt, we courageously determined to try, and issued an appeal to the public to join in our undertaking. We feel that some outside agency should make the survey and are now investigating methods of locating the most effective and desirable agency.

In spite of the proposed study, all three conferences in session on the ninth took forward steps in strengthening their regulations and the enforcement of them. One conference which has not previously had the "one year residence" rule adopted it. Another

conference decided to make its constitution conform in every essential with the constitution of the Southwest Athletic Conference. The Southwest Conference has itself strengthened its scholastic standards by requiring students to pass in two-thirds of the normal amount of work necessary for a degree in the two preceding semesters instead of one semester as has been the case previously. It has also abolished the plan of allowing work to be made up in the summer. It has also ruled that students who have not finished their eligibility are not allowed to play in inter-sectional games which follow the close of the regular season. Several proposals looking to the relaxing of some of our rules were met with a determined negative vote. Requests from the Association of Directors and Managers for the removal of certain restrictions were denied. The constitution was strengthened by adding to the requirements for membership a definite statement, which has been previously taken for granted, that the members of the conference must have faculty control. In view of these efforts to make higher standards in all of our conferences and to enforce our regulations rigidly, and also in view of our unanimous determination to study athletic conditions in this district with a view to making such improvements as shall be deemed necessary, we feel that we have good grounds for believing that such ills as we have will be discovered and will be cured. We are all in earnest about this matter and expect to have ere long the best conditions possible in athletics in the Sixth District.

Because of the enormous distances in the State of Texas, and, therefore, the inconvenience and cost of long trips, it seems likely that a new conference will be formed in the near future. At any rate, it is announced in the press that a meeting has been called for the consideration of such a movement. There is no prospect of a change as far as the Southwest Conference is concerned. None of its members anticipate withdrawing and the conference voted against enlarging its number for the present.

The successes of our athletes in this district during the past year have been gratifying. We are learning that in practically all sports we are as good as any and in some better. We rejoice that one of our Southwest athletes is a member of the World's Champion Doubles Tennis Team; that another one of our tennis men is Intercollegiate Singles Champion; and that the prospects are good for our having two men in the first ten in the national ranking list of tennis experts. We are proud of the showing which our men have made in track and field events. We look with pride upon the record made by one of our teams last year against the Army; of the victory of one of our teams this year over Oklahoma University; of another which tied Nebraska; and of another which defeated L. S. U. and Centenary. We are also proud of the fact that we begin the custom of holding relay games each spring by having two consecutive days of relays at

two of our institutions to which come all of the best track teams from the Middle West and often from other sections. Our principal pride in all of this is that we feel that our athletes are, for the most part, the finest kind of sportsmen and that we are producing strong, virile manhood through our sports.

As an illustration of the attitude of our conference members toward the whole question of athletic evils in our midst, I desire to cite the frankness of these men in answering a series of questions which I mailed to them before the meeting of the Southwest Conference, December 9. My first question related to faculty control; the second, to recruiting and subsidizing of athletes; and the third was in regard to the existence of any subscription fund in their local communities made by citizens to be used for paying athletes for services rendered. In each case there was entire frankness and, in response to my request, lists were sent of each athlete in the employ of the institution together with the amount paid to such athletes, and the rate of pay. This, to me, is a very hopeful indication of conditions in our midst. We have not yet reached the conclusion in this section that an athlete who works for a living, even if he works for the institution or for the Athletic Department, is subsidized for his athletic abilities. We are open to conviction on this point, and certainly this is one of the things which will be studied by the commission as indicated in a former paragraph. We at least feel that we are honest and frank. We will feel much better when we reach the place where misguided and over enthusiastic friends of our institutions on the outside are willing to leave the conduct of athletics to the faculties.

Intramural Athletics

Only in the larger institutions are we doing in this district as much as should be done in the way of intramural sports. The principal difficulty seems to be the lack of resources for financing them. So many of our schools are located in small towns, that the income from gate receipts is bareful sufficient for the support of intercollegiate athletics. Most of these schools are either private church schools or state supported schools. In the first group, the lack of endowment and the lack of sufficient income from other sources is such that there is no money for financing intramural sports, and in many cases, also, there are no resources for taking care of physical training. In the case of the second group, the appropriations are not large enough to justify the administration in using funds for such purposes. There seems to be no immediate remedy for this situation.

It is gratifying, however, to note that in our larger schools intramural sports are becoming much more popular and are

including a large proportion of the student body. In co-educational schools, this is true of both boys and girls.

I am pleased to add that the Southwest Conference voted to become a member of the American Olympic Association and that the Texas Conference and the Texas Intercollegiate Athletic Association voted to become allied members of the N. C. A. A.

Arkansas University is a member of the Southwest Conference and took its part in all the matters discussed in this report.

I have little first-hand information about Arizona, but hear good reports from their state university and feel sure that the outlook there is good. Both Arkansas and Arizona will be included in the proposed survey if they so desire.

SEVENTH DISTRICT

H. L. MARSHALL, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

The Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference continues to be the dominant organization in the Seventh District, and each year appears to bring active faculty control of athletics a little closer to reality. Though distances are great, the presidents of Conference institutions have already held one joint meeting with faculty representatives, and another such meeting is scheduled for March 1930. Highly significant developments are likely to result if the practice continues. As delicate a problem, for instance, as the salary of coaches was introduced at the last meeting, and the president of one of the leading universities of the district offered to abide by any schedule of maximums upon which the institutions might agree. Perhaps the idea of limitation of armament is contagious.

During the past year, Tunis and others have called attention to the fact that popular enthusiasm for football started in the extreme East, and then moved westward. They now give as their impression that football popularity has lessened in the East, and that this waning of interest will gradually move westward. If this be so, the wave does not appear to have yet passed over the Rocky Mountain region. Judged by game attendance, it is still ascendant. Both in Denver and in Salt Lake City during the past season new high records were established for gate receipts.

Generally speaking, Seventh District undergraduates are still in the "pep rally", "street parade" stage of pre-game enthusiasm. It appears that ultra exuberant practices of this type, still generally prevalent in high school, have now gone out of vogue in the East and even in the middle West.

The athletic directors and conference coaches now have a well established organization. This body meets in an adjoining room at the time of the meeting of the faculty representatives. Mat-

ters of common interest are circulated between the two groups, and the directors, opinion is frequently requested by the faculty group.

A standing committee on eligibility composed of faculty representatives has proved of great help in determining cases of eligibility referred to it by individual colleges. Through conference action, excursions of students involving over night stay or travel to attend contests have been prohibited. This prohibition includes the college band.

As years go on, it is evident that the influence and authority of the conference over individual members is being gradually extended. On the whole this tendency has resulted in an unquestioned improvement in the athletic practices of institutions.

Due to the recency of its publication, the full significance of Carnegie Bulletin 23 is not yet apparent. There appear to be some inaccuracies, but few well informed persons seem to doubt the essential validity of the major criticisms of athletic practices. The desirability of a rigid, objective investigation of its own recent practices, on the part of every college in the district, is obvious.

EIGHTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR W. B. OWENS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY

It is difficult to report in detail on athletic conditions existing throughout the Eighth District, but comments and reports from those in touch with the situation are generally satisfactory and appreciative, evidencing a feeling that progress in building up constructive programs is being steadily maintained. The year has been marked by comparative freedom from disputes over eligibility. Such problems as have arisen have, with few exceptions, been settled without attendant publicity.

The football season just closed has been one of intense interest. Teams have been evenly matched, games well and cleanly played, the officiating better, and free from criticism. Public interest has been keen in all the contests, and has not centered so completely in a few so-called "major" contests as in the past. This interest has extended to junior college and high school contests to a surprising degree. These institutions are developing their athletic programs under competent instructors and coaches, with quite adequate facilities in the way of equipment and playing fields. There is increasing attention in high schools and junior colleges to the development of intramural programs, which are meeting with marked success. The writer has been impressed with the provisions made by the high school and junior college authorities for athletic and physical education programs, with funds provided

by the public from taxes. The public has apparently been "sold" on the value of these programs as a part of public education. In at least one instance the program of a junior college includes competition in crew. Playing fields, gymnasias, tennis courts, etc., equalling or exceeding in extent the facilities possessed by many colleges, may be found at many of the high schools and junior colleges. Those in charge of the programs are, in general, competent, and doing good work, but the demand for trained men to conduct such work exceeds the supply.

To meet this demand, departments of physical education in the universities are enlarging their programs and reaching an increasingly large number of candidates. The importance of the work of these departments in training men for leading the athletic and physical education programs in the high schools and junior colleges cannot be overestimated. Really effective work with proper methods demands a high degree of training, going far beyond mere "playing experience".

The growth of junior colleges in number and in student population, commented upon in the last report, has continued. Some of these junior colleges are affiliated with high schools, others are independent (district) colleges. The total enrollment in junior colleges throughout the district is estimated at over fifteen thousand.

With the growth in number and population of the junior colleges and the development of their athletic programs, they have felt the need for uniform eligibility rules and organization into conferences. At least three junior college conferences are now functioning in the district.

The same process of organization is manifest among the high schools, whose programs are being well supervised, and eligibility rules establishing high standards effectively enforced. In some of the high school contests the plan of having the coaches off the field, leaving the game to be run by the players, has been tried. The opinions as to the success and advisability of the practice are conflicting.

The influence of this growth and improvement in athletic programs outside the universities is being manifest in the spread of public interest, commented upon at the beginning of this report. Local contests are attracting local interest, even on days when so-called major contests between the universities are played, and this may be expected to increase. Good teams and good contests are no longer confined to a few institutions.

There has been some reorganization talked of, and some effected, among the larger conferences. Saint Mary's College and Saint Ignatius are no longer in the Far Western Conference. San José State Teacher's College and Chico State Teacher's College have joined that conference. The question of appointing a commissioner for the Pacific Coast Conference is again to the

front, and will be considered at the next meeting, held the middle of December. The rules of the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference are being redrafted and will be fully discussed at the meeting. The report of the Carnegie Foundation will also be fully considered.

Increased interest in ice hockey has been manifest, and a league to promote competition has been formed.

There has been a growing interest in golf. Two universities in the district now have golf courses on the campus.

An experiment was made this year in the southern part of California with "night football". Several intercollegiate games were played at night. The experiment was quite successful both from the playing standpoint and in attendance, but whether it will become a permanent feature of our football seasons is doubtful.

Preparations are already being made for the Olympic Games in 1932. The State of California has appropriated a million dollars to assist in the staging of the games and preliminary work is well under way.

An effort has been made during the year to enlist the interest of more colleges throughout the district in the work of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and several institutions not heretofore affiliated with the Association have enrolled.

REPORTS OF RULES COMMITTEES

ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL (SOCCER)

The Association Football Rules Committee has not actually held a meeting this year. I have been in touch with some members of the committee from time to time, and we are able to report that the game is having a very satisfactory growth in the colleges and universities in this country, and the rules as they now stand are entirely satisfactory to the game and those interested.

I think our committee, all of whom are interested in and closely connected with the game of association football, makes for a very close check on the Association Football situation throughout the country. The secretary of our committee, Douglas Stewart, has made association football his hobby for the last thirty years, and I think probably has done more for the development of the game of association football in this country than any other man.

JOHN B. THAYER,
Chairman.

BASEBALL

The present members of the Special Committee on Baseball appointed by this Association three years ago are Dr. J. H. Nichols of Oberlin College, Professor C. S. Hicks of Massachusetts Agricultural College, and myself.

During the three years the committee has made a study of the situation of baseball in the colleges, and has not found its position good or improving. Some of the reasons for this situation have been given in previous reports of the committee. The special problem of the committee has been to determine whether a set of intercollegiate baseball rules should be printed, dissociated from the professional rules.

With this in mind, a set of intercollegiate rules was drawn up which in no way differ from the professional rules so far as they pertain to the technical aspect of the game, but from which had been deleted those portions of the rules which dealt with violations resulting in the imposing of fines and suspension, which portions were not compatible with the good sportsmanship which theoretically characterizes intercollegiate competition. Instead of those sections deleted from the professional rules, the committee has drawn up a code of sportsmanship and has substituted this for the deleted portion of the rules.

During the past year the revised rules and this code of good sportsmanship have been sent to the members of the Association.

with a view (1) of determining how many members approve the printing of separate rules and the adoption of the code of sportsmanship, and (2) to secure any suggestions which the various members of this Association might have for the improvement of the baseball situation.

Fifty-seven questionnaires were returned, properly filled out. In reply to the first question, as to whether separate rules should be printed, forty-one replied in the affirmative and sixteen in the negative. In reading the suggestions for the improvement of baseball, one is forced to the conclusion that the spirit of Mark Twain still lives. To illustrate this, one suggested the elimination of the auto; another suggested the increase in umpires' fees for college games; a third suggested the abolition of professional baseball; and a fourth suggested that a law to keep boys away from golf courses, if constitutional, would help. Many other suggestions were pertinent and suggested further study of the problem. Perhaps the most important one is that every coach should retain on the squad, and instruct, every man who reported for baseball—in other words, that large squads in baseball should be maintained. This would undoubtedly help in maintaining the interest of the undergraduate body. Another suggested that college games be quickened, that players be encouraged to run in and out at the beginning of an inning, and that the pitcher be stimulated to pitch more quickly than is usually the case—in other words, that the game be speeded up and thus be made more interesting to spectators. Another suggested the desirability of supporting the National Amateur Federation and the American Legion in their work in furthering the interest in baseball, and that an attempt be made to develop an interest in baseball from the point of view of sport and the elimination of the professional attitude towards this sport. Another suggested the value of intramural baseball games.

The committee is not at all certain of its position, but recommends, first, the publication of rules and the code of sportsmanship, and that these be separated definitely from the professional rules and not be incorporated in the professional rule book. Second, the enlargement of the committee to include in its membership those who are more proficient in the technical side of the game at the present time than the present members of the committee.

In conclusion, the committee urges that when these rules and the sportsmanship code are published, every effort be made by those in authority to familiarize the players with the code of sportsmanship not only by word of mouth, but through coaching on the field of play, and that the rules be adopted by the various conferences and individual colleges.

EDGAR FAUVER,
Chairman.

BASKETBALL

As chairman of the National Collegiate Basketball Rules Committee, I have the honor to submit the report of the activities of this committee during the current year.

It has been recognized for some time that a definite enlargement of the committee handling basketball rules is necessary. These rules are now international in scope. It was found inadvisable to carry out in detail recommendations for reorganization of the committee specifically made to the National Collegiate at the meeting last year. In principle, however, the recommendations made and approved by the National Collegiate have been followed.

Fifteen years ago conditions in regard to playing rules for basketball were somewhat chaotic and certainly unsatisfactory, three distinct sets of rules being sponsored and promulgated by three different organizations. Largely through the wise leadership of Dr. Joseph E. Raycroft, at that time chairman of the National Collegiate Basketball Committee, a joint rules committee was formed, consisting of representatives of the Amateur Athletic Union, International Y. M. C. A., and our National Collegiate group. The statement has been made before and is repeated at this time that this joint committee has worked in harmony and to the best interests of the game of basketball for a long period, and while it was felt that some justification existed for reapportionment of this committee, it has seemed unwise to insist on the ideas held by some of our National Collegiate men in face of opposition by the associate groups. The steps taken in reorganization have been approved by the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate. Briefly these steps have been as follows:

The National Collegiate Committee consists of one representative from each of the eight collegiate districts and two representatives at large, one of the representatives at large being Mr. Oswald Tower who has served most efficiently as editor of the Guide. The Amateur Athletic Union increased its rules committee representation to equal that of the National Collegiate, although this group also appointed Mr. Tower as one of its representatives. The International Y. M. C. A. increased its representation to equal that of the other original bodies. The following organizations have been invited into participating membership on this Joint Basketball Committee, namely, the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, two members; the Canadian Amateur Basketball Association, two members; the Chartered Boards of Basketball Officials, two members.

This enlarged Joint Basketball Committee met in New York in April and formulated the present set of basketball rules. Only minor changes were approved, and the current set of basketball rules seems to have been favorably received.

To facilitate rules legislation with so large a committee, a Rules Revision Committee consisting of twelve members has been formed. This sub-committee is able to handle in a satisfactory manner rules revision matters and present them to the Joint Committee. With the increase in number and the consequent increase in expense, it is necessary that some increased revenue be provided to carry on the work of the Basketball Committee. This problem is receiving consideration and a later report will be made by the Committee.

It is the belief of your Basketball Committee that basketball is in a healthy and stable condition. Definite progress has been made in improved handling of the game by the officials. Further effort is being made along this line. The organization of groups of officials for study of the rules and improvement in the administration of the game has been productive of much good.

The National Association of Basketball Coaches has expressed confidence in the Rules Committee organization, and is a helpful and powerful group in the matter of improvement in the basketball game.

L. W. ST. JOHN,
Chairman.

FOOTBALL

From the point of view of the Rules Committee, the season of 1929 was eminently satisfactory and gratifying. Never have we seen more well fought, closely contested games, such wide variety of strategy, less misunderstanding and bickering about the rules, or better officiating. Throughout the season, evidence continued to accumulate that the changes which have been made in the rules during the past few years are steadily proving their value.

The Fumble Rule

In no case has the evidence been more convincing than in the case of the 1929 fumble rule. At the beginning of the season there was much doubt expressed as to the wisdom of this rule. Most of the criticism was so obviously based on a lack of understanding of the real reasons for the rule and the objects it was expected to accomplish that it seems worthwhile to restate the principal reasons for this change.

Makes Possible the Development of Lateral Pass

The primary purpose of the rule is to broaden and strengthen the strategy of the attack by inviting freer backward or lateral passes from one runner to another. It has been clear for years to

any one who has followed football why the use of the backward or lateral pass had become so restricted. The hazard was too great. If the pass was not caught and the ball was fumbled, the defensive player breaking through might not only recover the ball, but if he happened to recover it back of all or most of all the players of the team which had fumbled it, he might run on through an unprotected field for a touchdown.

For the last three years, your committee has been working toward the elimination of this hazard. In the 1927 rules the backward pass was given the full limit of protection, and the ball after striking the ground was dead in all cases at the point of recovery. In the 1928 rules, the protection was narrowed and limited to passes of at least two yards in length. While both of these changes tended toward the developing of freer passing, their provisions were necessarily somewhat complicated. In 1929, your Committee reached the conclusion that the most direct, the simplest, and the most effective way to accomplish the object was to remove all special provisions and simply to make a fumbled ball dead at the point of recovery by the opponents. This entirely removed the chief hazard which had prevented the development of free handling of the ball behind the scrimmage line, and accomplished this object without complicating the rules.

Simplifies the Rules

As a matter of fact, it has very much simplified the rules, and this is one of the reasons for the rule in its present form. It eliminates the necessity of differentiating between an unsuccessful backward or lateral pass and an ordinary fumble. The same rule applies in all cases. If the ball strikes the ground, the opponent may recover but may not advance it.

Minimizes Winning by Flukes

Another justification for the rule is that it tends to reduce to a minimum the winning of games by a fluke and the neutralizing of an earned touchdown by one that is unearned. It is generally good, snappy football when an opponent recovers a fumbled ball, but it is usually pure unadulterated luck if the opponent happens to recover it under conditions that give him a chance to run it back for a touchdown.

Fumble Rule a Corollary of Muffed Punt Rule

Having taken away (in the 1927 rules) from the offense the opportunity of recovering a muffed punt and running it through an unprotected field for a touchdown, it was not only logical but simple fairness to the offense to take away from the defense the

opportunity of recovering a fumble and running it back through an unprotected field. These two changes have eliminated from the game the two outstanding opportunities for games to be won on flukes, and at the same time have made it possible to greatly simplify the rules.

Criticisms of Fumble Rule

The two principal criticisms of the fumble rule were that it would tend to promote fumbling, and that it would take some of the thrills out of the game. The first of these is absurd if intended to mean that the rule would tend to promote careless handling of the ball. The loss of the possession of the ball is in itself a serious enough penalty to prevent carelessness. Possession of the ball often means the difference between victory and defeat, and almost always means as much as the loss of 35 yards of distance. It may be that there will be more balls fumbled if the rule is successful in developing freer passing, but it will be because of more daring rather than more careless handling of the ball.

Legislation is for the Players

As to the criticism that the rule deprives the spectator of one of the great thrills in the game, it might be appropriate to again restate the fact that the Rules Committee has always proceeded on the theory that the game is primarily to provide wholesome sport for the hundreds of thousands of boys who play it rather than to provide thrills for the tens of millions of those who watch them play. There are plenty of other real values that the spectators can derive from watching this game of football that are infinitely more worthwhile than an occasional fleeting thrill from a fluke play.

Far be it from me to intimate that the thrills should be removed from the game. Much of the fascination which the game holds for players and spectator alike comes from the fact that it is a game which abounds in thrills—legitimate, inspiring, blood-tingling thrills. A determined march down the field—a brilliant long run made possible by skillful dodging aided by timely and clever interference—a beautifully executed forward pass—a drop kick from a difficult angle—a not-to-be-denied plunge through the line—a flying tackle by the last man between the runner and the goal line—the skillful catching and running in of a kick—a “they shall not pass” “never say die” defence of a team’s goal line—a masterly interception of a forward pass—a perfect execution of a daring stroke of bold strategy—a team coming from behind and snatching victory from defeat in the last minute of play by sheer skill and grit—all these provide thrills aplenty for

the true sportsman whether he be player or spectator; and a fluke touchdown resulting from an unopposed run by a player who happened to be lucky enough to pick up a fumbled ball with nobody else around is not to be classed in the same category.

Whatever thrills may have been removed from the game by the fumble rule will in the next few years be generously replaced many times over by the more legitimate thrills that will inevitably come with the gradual development of more daring handling and passing of the ball.

The Screened Pass

The other two important changes in the 1929 rules were aimed at the screened pass and the so-called "bootleg ball". Both of these changes have convincingly accomplished their object. The "bootleg ball" has disappeared. The officials and coaches have coöperated in making effective the revised wording of the rule prohibiting the screening of the forward pass, and the screened pass we trust has gone permanently into the discard.

Coaches Assisting in Making Protective Equipment Safe

Your Committee has always found it extremely difficult to describe and specify in detail every kind of equipment, the wearing of which is considered dangerous to other players. In the 1929 rules, we asked the coaches to accept themselves primary responsibility for making sure that all devices designed for the protection or convenience of the wearer should be so constructed and arranged as not to constitute a source of danger to other players. The coaches very generally throughout the country have responded to this suggestion in fine spirit, and it is hoped that we have at last found the answer to a problem that is almost impossible to solve through legislation alone.

More Goals from the Field

It has been interesting to note during the past season the increasing number of goals from the field. When the goal posts were moved back from the goal line, many friends of the game feared that it might result in the disappearance of the goal from field as a real factor in the attack. That coaches and field captains are beginning to realize that moving back the goal posts simply means that the ball must be brought ten yards closer to the goal line before trying for a goal has been increasingly evident during the past season. It has also been interesting to note that several goals from the field were successfully executed from points so near the side lines that the angle would have made the goal almost impossible if the posts had been on the goal line.

More and Better Punting

It has also been gratifying to note during the past season distinctly more widespread use of the punt as one of the powerful weapons of the attack. The kicking on the whole has apparently averaged better than for many seasons, and in many games it has been the good kicking, and especially the well directed placing of the kick, which has been the decisive factor in winning the game.

Secondary Schools

In the 1929 rules, the Committee inserted a provision under which preparatory and high school teams by mutual agreement might adopt more liberal regulations regarding substitutions. The reasons for this provision are of course obvious, and it has been gratifying to learn that many secondary schools have made use of this permission during the past season, and that they feel that it is distinctly in the interests of the boys who are participating in the secondary school games.

The Committee this year continued its practice of the last two years of inviting the National Coaches' Association to appoint an Advisory Committee of three from its membership to sit with your Committee throughout all of its meetings. This practice is distinctly helpful to the deliberations of your Committee, and we have invited the Coaches' Association to appoint a similar committee for the coming year.

No change is contemplated in the personnel of the Advisory Committee of Officials for 1930, as the members of that Committee have all been serving as members of the Recodification Committee and have been working throughout the year on the rewriting of the rules. Their services will be most valuable in finishing up the work.

Recodification of Rules

As to the rules for the season of 1930, I think I speak for all of my associates in expressing the belief that the experience of the past year has disclosed neither the necessity nor the desirability of any material change in the rules. This is especially gratifying since the work of recodifying and rewriting the rules on which we reported progress last year is now nearing completion and the necessity of introducing new matter in the rules at this time would be unfortunate.

The recodification of the rules takes the form of a general rearrangement in which the attempt has been made to bring together all the provisions bearing on a given subject under the same rule. The attempt is also being made to simplify the rules wherever possible, and, while this may lead to a few changes, they will not be such as will affect the play, but they will be directed toward simplification and clarity.

After the recodification, which is now in its fourth draft, is tentatively approved by the Rules Committee, it will be submitted to various friends and students of the game for criticism and suggestion, after which it will be taken up for final action by the Rules Committee at its annual meeting in March.

E. K. HALL,
Chairman.

BOXING

The Committee on Boxing begs to report that the Intercollegiate Boxing Association is now holding dual meets between the six members, and also an intercollegiate boxing championship meet which was held last year at Pennsylvania State College.

An interesting point has been raised about the question of weights, by Lt. McGaw, a member of the Committee, whose letter I quote:

"As you know, to become a cadet a young man has certain physical requirements which he must measure up to. One of these requirements is that he must be of a weight in excess of the lightest boxing class, 115 pounds. Obviously, for us to put cadets in that class it was necessary for us to take weight from certain naturally frail boys, thereby endangering their health. This we decided to discontinue, so we wrote to our prospective opponents, stating the situation to them. We told them that we would like to box in the six other weights, or we would box seven bouts giving our opponents the privilege of selecting a weight in which they would like to enter two men, thus requiring us to do likewise. Of our eight opponents, one chose the six bout suggestion, six selected the weight to substitute for the 115 pound class, and one college refused any change in the rules whatsoever.

Along this line I might mention that two of our opponents had no heavyweights. We were glad to eliminate that weight from those meets, in which case we selected a weight to substitute for the heavyweight division.

The plans set forth above worked well and to the satisfaction of home teams, and likewise to the opponents. As yet we haven't arranged the details for the 1930 season, but from the success of the system instituted in 1929 I believe that we will continue along the same lines.

I think the idea of substitution is good and should be included in the Intercollegiate Rules."

The present weights are: bantam weight, 115 pounds; featherweight, 125 pounds; lightweight, 135 pounds; welterweight, 145 pounds; middleweight, 160 pounds; light heavyweight, 175 pounds; heavyweight, all over 175 pounds.

As it is the custom to allow four pounds over weight, this really raises them by that amount, and we would strongly recommend that this allowance of four pounds be abolished and that the weights stand as they read in the Rule Book, without any allowance for excess.

The Intercollegiate Association is undertaking the compilation of a year book, and in reprinting the rules of boxing and wrestling I would suggest that definite action be taken to determine the exact status of the competitors in each weight.

R. TAIT MCKENZIE,
Chairman.

GYMNASTICS

There is no visible progress to report this year for the committee. We have, however, accomplished a lot in getting the groundwork laid for getting in touch with the many sections now operating under different sets of rules, and will in the next year actually get to the real job of securing acceptance of a uniform set of rules.

CHAS. W. GRAYDON,
Chairman.

ICE HOCKEY

The 1929-1930 Guide, through the continued and efficient efforts of the editor, Mr. Rufus James Trimble of the committee, and Mr. John D. Doyle of the American Sports Publishing Company, is enabled to present the records of fifty teams more than the preceding year. Diagrams illustrating the on-side and other rules have been added by way of further clarification.

Changes in the content of the rules made by the committee have been few, and consist mainly in rearrangement, rephrasing, and added notes of explanation.

There appears to be an increased participation in the game, and, while the N. C. A. A. rules have been adopted for amateur play in this country, they still seem to be as yet only partially enforced. This varying usage of interpretation is probably due to the lack of uniform and consistent coaching and officiating, and this in turn may be due to a scarcity of coaches and officials who have played under collegiate rules. The most vital present need is the developing of officials, their grouping for better officiating, as is being done in football and basketball, and their acceptance and support on the part of coaches and players. The importance of this is all the more evident when we consider how fast, vigorous, and sometimes unavoidably rough ice hockey is as a game. It should be remembered that its development, perfec-

tion, and continued existence depend primarily upon skillful skating, legitimate stick handling, and coordinated team play. So far as stick handling is concerned, the intent must be to play the puck and not the player. There also must be a sharp distinction made between legitimate body checking and charging.

In order to safeguard the game for schools and colleges, the rules committee seeks the coöperation of coaches, officials, and players. Emphasis upon the spirit of the rules and the proper enforcement of them during practice and competition will be the test of their justice, and the basis for support or change.

Constructive suggestions will be welcomed by the committee; in order to be considered for the following year they should reach the committee not later than the end of the present playing season.

ALBERT I. PRETTYMAN,
Chairman.

SWIMMING AND WATER SPORTS

Your Committee on Rules for Swimming and Water Sports respectfully submits the following as a report of its activities during the past year:

The Sixth Annual National Collegiate Swimming Championships of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were held at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri, on March 29th and 30th, 1929, in the Wilson Natatorium. The meet was well supported by representatives from colleges over a wide area of the United States. The Intercollegiate Swimming Association of the East was represented by Princeton and Dartmouth; the Eastern Collegiate Swimming Association by Rutgers; the Southern Intercollegiate Conference by Georgia Tech.; the Big Ten by Chicago, Illinois, Iowa, Northwestern, Michigan, and Minnesota; the Missouri Valley Conference by Washington and Drake; the Rocky Mountain Conference by Brigham Young University; the Ohio Conference by the University of Cincinnati; while Armour Institute of Chicago and Oklahoma City University were representatives-at-large. The above institutions were represented by 62 actual contestants.

As a result of action taken at the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, New Orleans, during the holidays of 1928, invitations to this meet were extended to colleges and universities of Canada and Mexico. Several of these institutions expressed gratification at the invitation but for various reasons were unable to come. The Rules Committee hopes to attract such foreign intercollegiate representatives in another year.

In line with the established policy of the National Collegiate

Athletic Association the general control and operation of the meet was vested in the Swimming Rules Committee, who, with the coöperation of the visiting coaches and local representatives, also comprised the officials for the meet. Mr. A. E. Eilers, business manager of intercollegiate athletics at Washington University, a member of the National Collegiate Swimming Rules Committee, was in charge of the detailed business management of the meet, and deserves great praise for the efficient manner in which the many details of this contest were managed. A delightful feature of this annual gathering was the dinner given at the Hotel Chase for all visiting coaches, officials, and members of the Rules Committee by the Board in Control of Athletics at Washington University, headed by Dean McCourt, Assistant Chancellor. Both preliminaries and finals of the meet were marked by excellent officiating, hard fought competition in every event, and fine expressions of sportsmanship on the part of contestants and spectators. Preliminaries and finals also had a capacity attendance. The gross receipts of the meet were \$953.00, the expenditures \$503.00, leaving \$450.00 which was pro-rated to the visiting teams in accordance with the number of contestants and distance travelled. A detailed financial report of the meet as submitted by Mr. Eilers was sent to the Executive Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and to each of the institutions represented in the meet.

From the point of view of stellar performances of contestants, the Sixth National Collegiate Swimming Championships surpass all preceding similar meets. In fact the records made give indisputable objective evidence that it was the greatest intercollegiate meet ever held. New N. C. A. A. records (records made in these National Championships) were established in every swimming event. In addition to this, new national intercollegiate records (records which may be made in any dual or championship intercollegiate meet) were established in four events, and above all, a world's record was set up as the highest point of record breaking.

Although the detailed results of this meet appear in the Annual Intercollegiate Swimming Guide, published by the American Sports Publishing Company under the direction of this committee, the outstanding performances of two individuals are worthy of notice here. George Kojac, of Rutgers University and recent Olympic champion, established a world's record in the 150 yard backstroke, with the remarkable performance of 1 minute 38 $\frac{2}{5}$ second, a fraction below his own former world's record. Bud Shields of Brigham Young University for the second successive year won first place in both the 220 yard free style and 440 yard free style events, having established a new N. C. A. A. record or national intercollegiate record in each event each time.

Two meetings of the rules committee were held during the

year. The first was an informal meeting held in New York at the time of the National Collegiate Athletic Association meetings, and was attended by such representatives of the committee as were present, in order to take care of routine business that needed joint consideration. The regular annual meeting of the committee was held in conjunction with the National Collegiate Swimming Championships at Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri. Four of the five members of the executive committee and two members of the advisory committee comprised the attendance. In accordance also with past practice, our rules committee sessions have been open to visiting coaches. A thorough study of the rules was made in the light of suggestions and criticisms presented by the College Swimming Coaches Association and by other friends of swimming in intercollegiate and interscholastic circles of the United States. As a result your committee feels that significant progress in rules standardization has been accomplished, particularly in the rules governing diving, the breast stroke, and in the elimination or clarification of notes to other regulations. In general, it is the judgment of the rules committee that the rules are meeting with wide-spread satisfaction. It is frankly admitted that certain minor sectional differences in program of events or interpretation of rules stubbornly persist, as is common also in other playing rules. These differences are annually subjected to further study directed toward a satisfactory solution.

The Intercollegiate Swimming Guide again made its appearance early in October under the very capable editorship of Philip S. Harburger, of Columbia University, who took over the editorial task late in the year and with very satisfactory results. In this connection, the rules committee also acknowledges with gratitude the very splendid work done by Frank Sullivan, who was editor of the Swimming Guide for many years.

Plans for the Seventh Annual National Collegiate Swimming Championships are well under way. The meet will be held in the new pool at Harvard University on March 28th and 29th, 1930. All outstanding swimmers in the various leagues and conferences of the National Collegiate Athletic Association are invited to participate.

F. W. LUEHRING,
Chairman.

WRESTLING

Second Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Meet

The second annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships were held at Ohio State University, Columbus, on March 29 and 30. Sixty-one wrestlers, representing twenty-five differ-

ent institutions, participated. Nearly all of the participants were State, Conference, or Wrestling Association champions or runners-up, in their respective classes. In comparison with the 1928 meet these figures represent an increase of over 50% in the number of individual participants, and about the same increase in the number of institutions represented.

Your committee was especially pleased with the increased geographical distribution of the entries because this year ten of the sixty-one participants came from the East and South, while last year, with one exception, all of the contestants came from the Middle West and Southwest. This means much to the development of intercollegiate wrestling, because it means the breaking down of sectional prejudice. It is the opening wedge which will lead to a collegiate wrestling meet of real national scope.

Another encouraging feature of the meet was the fact that there was an average of approximately two participants to each institution represented, which indicates that the institutions sent only their outstanding wrestlers. Your committee has no desire to make this meet the largest amateur wrestling meet in the country, but we do hope that the day will soon come when it will represent the highest calibre of amateur wrestling, and when all of our college wrestlers will consider the honor of winning this meet second only to membership on the American Olympic Team. We believe the time is not far distant when it will be advisable for the committee to limit participation to winners of first and second places in the various intercollegiate conference and association meets, and to a few other outstanding wrestlers representing institutions which are not members of such organizations.

The attendance at the meet was lamentably small, considering the importance of the meet and the high calibre of the competition, therefore the gate receipts and the resulting refunds on traveling expenses to the visiting contestants were not as large as they were from the 1928 meet. To partially offset this, however, the Athletic Board of Ohio State University generously agreed to pay all of the local expenses of the meet, and this made it possible for the local manager to refund to the visiting contestants over 20% of the cost of transportation. The Wrestling Rules Committee is greatly indebted to Mr. W. D. Griffith, of Ohio State University, for the efficient manner in which he managed the meet.

The 1928 meet was conducted as an individual championship meet, but it was deemed advisable to make the 1929 meet a team as well as an individual championship meet. This change undoubtedly increased the interest in the meet.

The team championship was won by the strong and versatile Oklahoma A. & M. College team. The versatility of the team is demonstrated by the fact that representatives of Oklahoma A. & M. College won four first places and two third places in the eight

classes. The University of Michigan also presented a strong team, scoring in five of the eight classes.

The standing of the various teams which scored points in the meet is shown in the following table:

Institution	115	125	135	145	155	165	175	Hvy. Falls	Total
Oklahoma A. & M.	1	1	—	5	5	5	—	5	26
University of Mich.	—	3	—	3	3	1	3	—	18
Univ. of Oklahoma	3	5	3	—	—	—	—	—	13
Univ. of Illinois	5	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	11
Univ. of Wisconsin	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	3	9
Cornell University	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	7
Purdue University	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	4
Ohio State University	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
University of Iowa	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	2
Univ. of West Virginia	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2
Mechanics Institute	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Univ. of Nebraska	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1

The following institutions scored no points, but were represented by excellent wrestlers who gave the winners strong competition and helped to make the meet a successful one: Case School of Applied Science; Chicago University; Cornell College; Indiana Central College; Iowa State College; Kent State Normal; Marshall College; Northwestern University; Ohio University; Pennsylvania State College; Virginia Polytechnic Institute; Western Reserve University; and Wilmington College.

The individual winners were as follows:

Class	1st Place	2nd Place	3rd Place
115 lb.	Sapora, Univ. of Ill.	Leach, Okla. Univ.	Shockley, Okla. A. & M.
125 lb.	Mantooth, Okla. Univ.	Hewitt, Mich. Univ.	Hesser, Okla. A. & M.
135 lb.	Minot, Univ. of Ill.	Miller, Okla. Univ.	Cox, West Va. Univ.
145 lb.	Bancroft, Okla. A. & M.	Kelly, Univ. of Mich.	Montgomery, Univ. of Iowa
155 lb.	Van Bebber, Okla. A. & M.	Parker, Univ. of Mich.	Hammer, Univ. of Wisconsin
165 lb.	Caldwell, Okla. A. & M.	Hooker, Purdue Univ.	Warren, Univ. of Mich.
175 lb.	Stafford, Cornell Univ.	Dougovito, Univ. of Mich.	Heywood, Univ. of Wisconsin
Heavy-weight	McCready, Okla. A. & M.	Swenson, Univ. of Wis.	Fairall, Ohio State Univ.

Conference with Wrestling Coaches

The wrestling coach of practically every institution which participated was present at the meet. The committee was especially pleased that several of the larger institutions which were unable

to send contestants to the meet, because of the limited number of cuts allowed members of the wrestling team or because the wrestlers which they had entered were injured shortly before the meet, did send their coaches. This list included: C. F. Foster, Princeton; John Schutz, U. S. Naval Academy; E. D. O'Donnell, Yale; Blaine McKusick, University of Minnesota; and W. H. Thom, University of Indiana. Dr. D. B. Sinclair, of Princeton, a member of the Advisory Committee of the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association, was also present.

Several conferences were arranged between the coaches and the members of the Wrestling Rules Committee. The present rules and suggested changes in the rules were freely discussed. It was the general consensus of opinion of the coaches present that the 1928-29 rules were highly satisfactory, and they recommended that no changes be made for the year 1929-30 except in some minor details. As a result of these conferences the few changes to be found in the 1929-30 rules were made to harmonize, so far as possible, conflicting ideas in different sections of the country on methods of conducting matches, and to further clarify the rules by changes in phraseology.

It is the hope of the committee that the practice of sending the wrestling coaches to this meet, even though participants cannot be sent, will become quite universal. Such a practice will result in a better understanding of the correct interpretation of the rules by the coaches, and this in turn will obviate to a large extent unpleasant protests and differences of opinion by coaches of competing teams. It will also result in a broader knowledge of the technique of wrestling, because visiting coaches will observe and absorb the finer points of wrestling demonstrated by contestants from other sections of the country and, therefore, the visiting coaches and the institutions they represent will profit. Benefits will result, too, from the informal discussions, broader acquaintance, and friendly contact between the coaches—all of which will make for better sportsmanship in our wrestling competition.

*Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association
Adopts N. C. A. A. Rules*

At a meeting of the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association, held in New York City on October 20, 1929, the National Collegiate wrestling rules were formally adopted by this association. Inasmuch as all of the other wrestling associations in the country adopted these rules some time ago, the N. C. A. A. wrestling rules have now become in reality the national collegiate rules of the country.

There is also a possibility that, in the near future, the wrestling committee of the Amateur Athletic Union may adopt the major

part of our rules, specifically all of those rules applying to the conduct of matches. Many of the Y. M. C. A. teams of the country now use our rules and others the A. A. U. rules; therefore, adoption of our rules by the A. A. U. would result in making the N. C. A. A. rules the standard amateur wrestling rules of the country.

A number of the individual rules which are not found in the A. A. U. or other wrestling codes have appeared, with slightly altered wording, in the new Olympic rules—a fact which would seem to indicate that your committee has really developed a superior wrestling code, otherwise the Olympic Committee would not wish to incorporate parts of the N. C. A. A. rules into their own.

General Increased Interest in Intercollegiate and Interscholastic Wrestling

Interest in both intercollegiate and interscholastic wrestling has shown a steady and highly satisfactory growth during the past year in nearly all sections of the country, both in amount of participation and in general interest—as evidenced by the increased attendance at matches.

In the East, most of the larger institutions maintain varsity and freshman intercollegiate wrestling teams, and a number of the members of the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association have plans practically completed for junior varsity intercollegiate competition during the coming season.

Lehigh University reports that more candidates are out for wrestling than for any other intercollegiate sport. Cornell University reports a wrestling squad of two hundred. Many institutions in the East which are not members of the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association or the New England Wrestling Association have varsity wrestling teams, and conduct quite extensive dual meet schedules.

In the South, active participation in intercollegiate wrestling is limited to a relatively small number of institutions, but these institutions report larger squads and growing interest. There is an opportunity for missionary work to develop more general interest in wrestling in the colleges of the South.

In the South-west, interest in wrestling is confined pretty largely to the state of Oklahoma—where perhaps intercollegiate and interscholastic wrestling are more highly developed than in any other state in the Union. At Oklahoma A. & M. College, wrestling is the outstanding major sport, eclipsing even football. During the coming season the University of Texas will reinstate wrestling as an intercollegiate sport. At other institutions in the South-west participation in wrestling is confined to intramural competition.

In the Middle West, during the past year participation and interest in the sport has continued to grow, not only in the larger institutions which are members of the "Big Ten" and "Big Six" conferences, but also in the smaller institutions which are members of the state intercollegiate athletic associations. State college conference wrestling meets were held in Iowa and Ohio.

In the Rocky Mountain district, owing to the great distances between the institutions making up the Rocky Mountain conference, this association is organized into an Eastern and a Western division for wrestling competition and dual and divisional championship meets were held, but there was no general Rocky Mountain Conference wrestling meet. This conference hopes to send a few representatives to the third annual N. C. A. A. meet.

On the Pacific coast, intercollegiate wrestling was revived last year. The situation, as regards geographical location, is similar to that in the Rocky Mountain district, and consequently the Pacific Coast Conference was divided into a northern and a southern section for wrestling competition. Some dual and Northern and Southern division championship meets were held. Inasmuch as some of the most skilled amateur wrestlers of the country are to be found on the Western coast, we hope that such interest will develop in the near future as to warrant the sending of wrestling teams from this conference to the N. C. A. A. meet.

Many colleges and universities now recognize wrestling as a major sport, ranking equally with basketball, baseball, and track.

High School Rules

In response to numerous requests from high school coaches, your committee drew up a brief set of high school wrestling rules last year and they were incorporated in the 1928-29 Guide. These rules met with quite general approval and were adopted as official rules by many of the state high school athletic associations. As a result of much correspondence with those interested in high school wrestling and the coöperation of a committee consisting of Mr. Hugo Otopalik of Iowa State College and Mr. B. E. Wiggins, Director of Physical Education in the public schools of Columbus, Ohio, a much more elaborate and, we believe, a much better high school code has been formulated and printed in the 1929-30 Guide. The National Collegiate rules are recommended in this code, except where the college rules are not suitable for high school competition.

There has been a marked increase in the interest in high school wrestling during the past year, and it promises, in the near future, to become one of the most prominent interscholastic sports. Inasmuch as this committee has undertaken to formulate high school wrestling rules, and is likely to continue to serve as the rule-making body for national interscholastic wrestling, it would

appear to be an appropriate move to add a high school representative to the wrestling rules committee, and your committee, therefore, recommends that such a member, to be selected by the National Federation of High School Athletic Associations, be added to the wrestling rules committee.

1929-30 Intercollegiate Wrestling Guide

The National Collegiate Wrestling Guide has grown in four years from a pamphlet of a few pages to the 1929-30 comprehensive edition of 121 pages, which not only contains the National Collegiate and interscholastic rules, as recommended by your committee, but also many interesting and instructive articles on wrestling, and a large number of cuts of the leading college and high school wrestling teams of the country, and cuts of the outstanding individual college and high school wrestlers. The chairman takes this opportunity to thank Mr. G. M. Trautman, the editor, Dr. J. E. Raycroft, chairman of the N. C. A. A. Publication Board, and the American Sports Publishing Company, for their efficient work in bringing this Guide up to its present high standard.

Location of the N. C. A. A. Meet

Your committee is of the opinion that the best interest of intercollegiate wrestling will be served if the annual N. C. A. A. championship meet can be held in the east and middle west on alternate years. The committee has invitations from Lehigh University, Pennsylvania State College, and West Virginia University, for the 1930 meet, and in accordance with the opinion indicated above, the committee will undoubtedly recommend the acceptance of one of these three invitations.

R. G. CLAPP,
Chairman.

VOLLEY BALL

Volleyball is gradually growing as an intramural game in the colleges. The Collegiate Committee has recommended to the joint committee definite study of the weight of the volleyball with reference to keeping its shape and wearing qualities. Some of the committee are now trying out the increase in the weight of the ball, one-half ounce, and one full ounce. The thin cutting of the leather destroys wearing qualities along the seams, and also makes it more difficult to keep the shape of the ball.

It is further recommended that the different districts encourage through a district committee the development of intramural volley ball.

J. H. McCURDY,
Chairman.

TRACK AND FIELD

The N. C. A. A. track and field rules committee met in Chicago at the time of the National Collegiate track and field meet. Those present were: W. A. Alexander, Georgia School of Technology; T. E. Jones, University of Wisconsin; Henry F. Schulte, University of Nebraska; Clyde Littlefield, University of Texas; Dr. Creed Haymond (Pennsylvania), Salt Lake City, Utah; C. S. Edmundson, University of Washington; E. A. Thomas, Kansas State High School Athletic Association, representing the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations; Lieutenant Bonnar E. Fellers, U. S. Military Academy; Mr. Walter Christie, University of California; and John L. Griffith, Chairman. Mr. A. C. Gilbert (Yale) and Dr. C. W. Kennedy, Princeton University, representatives of the first and second N. C. A. A. districts on the committee, were unable to be present.

Prior to the meeting of the committee the committeemen canvassed the coaches and officials of their districts for suggestions relative to modifications in the rules. The rules on the whole were found to be very satisfactory, therefore the committee deemed it desirable to make but few changes in them. Those made were primarily for the purpose of clearing up ambiguities.

All of the material for the Rules Book was sent to the publisher earlier than ever before, and the publication should be on the market not later than January 1. It will contain the College Honor Roll,—the best records made by American college men both during and after undergraduate competition,—suggestions on officiating, the High School Honor Roll, high school records, the results of important school and college meets, and pictures of many of the outstanding college and high school teams.

The N. C. A. A. track and field rules are followed by nearly all of the sixty-five college conferences in the United States. They have been officially adopted by the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations, and are used in practically all grade school and high school meets in this country. Further, they have been adopted as official by the United States Army, the United States Navy, and the Y. M. C. A. They are being used by a majority of the amateur organizations that are conducting track meets in America. In general, these rules conform to the international rules used in the Olympic Games.

JOHN L. GRIFFITH,
Chairman.

N. C. A. A. TRACK AND FIELD MEET

The Eighth Annual N. C. A. A. Track and Field Meet was held on Stagg Field, Chicago, June 7 and 8, 1929. The original committee, Messrs. Griffith, Jones, and Stagg, were in charge.

The meet will be historical by the fact that a new world's record of $9\frac{2}{5}$ seconds was established by G. S. Simpson of Ohio State University in the 100-yards dash. A new record of 159 ft. $1\frac{7}{8}$ in. was made in the discus throw by P. H. Rasmus of Ohio State, which beat the best previous N. C. A. A. record by 9 ft. $11\frac{7}{8}$ in. New N. C. A. A. records were also made in three other events, namely: 20.8 seconds in the 220-yards dash, by G. S. Simpson of Ohio State, supplanting 20.9 seconds made by R. A. Locke of the University of Nebraska in 1926 and A. Bracey of Rice Institute in 1928; 50 ft. 3 in. in the shot put, by H. Rothert of Stanford University, supplanting 50 ft. $\frac{3}{4}$ in. made by John Kuck of Kansas State Teachers College in 1926; and 13 ft. $8\frac{7}{8}$ in. in the pole vault by R. W. Edmonds of Stanford University and T. Warne of Northwestern University, who tied at this height, supplanting 13 ft. $6\frac{1}{2}$ in. made by R. W. Edmonds of Stanford University in 1928.

Ohio State won the team championship by scoring 50 points on the basis of 10 for first, 8 for second, 6 for third, 4 for fourth, 2 for fifth, and 1 for sixth. The University of Washington was second with 42 points, the University of Illinois third with $35\frac{1}{2}$ points, the University of Southern California fourth with 32 points, Stanford University fifth with 28 points.

It is interesting to observe how strong the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Meet has been from the beginning. The initial meet in 1921 started off with 45 colleges competing from 21 different states. In the 2nd meet there were 46 colleges from 21 states; in the 3rd, 59 from 25 states; in the 4th, 51 from 24 states; in the 5th, 56 from 25 states; in the 6th, 64 from 26 states; in the 7th, 61 from 28 states; and in the 8th, 69 from 25 states. An analysis of the number of colleges winning points is also interesting. In the 1st meet 30 colleges scored, in the 2nd 29, in the 3rd 35, in the 4th 24, in the 5th 39, in the 6th 44, in the 7th 39, and in the 8th 47.

Because the committee has felt the advisability of making this strictly a championship meet and thereby limiting the athletes to high class performers, emphasis has been laid not on the number of competitors but on the quality. One hundred and thirteen men competed in the 1st meet, 154 in the 2nd, 178 in the 3rd, 157 in the 4th, 179 in the 5th, 183 in the 6th, 206 in the 7th, and 206 in the 8th.

The records and quality of competition were splendid throughout the 1929 meet. The preliminaries on Friday presaged the establishing of a new world's record in the 100-yard dash by the

fact that G. S. Simpson of Ohio State and E. Tolan of Michigan each won their heats in 9.5 seconds, while C. A. Bracey of Rice Institute and C. Leland of Texas Christian University each won heats in 9.6 seconds. In the 220-yard dash, three of the four heats in the preliminaries were run in 21.1 sec., 21.4 sec., and 21.5 seconds. In the preliminaries of the 440-yard run the three heats were run in 48.3 sec., 48.9 sec., and 49.2 seconds. In the preliminaries of the 120-yard high hurdles two of the four heats were won in 14.9 seconds, a third in 15 seconds, and a fourth in 15.1 seconds.

The coaches and managers met on Friday morning and decided on the drawings for the preliminaries that afternoon. At the banquet in the evening, there were long and interesting discussions, one of them being on the value of starting blocks of various kinds. It was the consensus of opinion of the coaches present that starting blocks were not of any particular value in starting, but it was agreed that they saved time in running off meets, avoided tearing up the track, and also gave firmness where the paths had been dug up by previous starters.

An excellent report was presented by Col. Sellers of the United States Army of the effect of wind pressure on runners. He showed mathematically what the pressure of a five mile wind was when running with it and when running against it, and stated that it was his judgment that up to five miles it did not make much difference whether a man was running with or against the wind. He stated that a wind directly across did not affect the runner either way. Coach Edmondson, of the University of Washington, who had made some tests in running with and against the wind, contributed to the discussion with the results of his experiments. Coach Walter Christie, of the University of California who has done a lot of professional sprinting brought forth a big laugh when he said, "Maybe it could be mathematically proven that it would not make any difference whether a man ran with or against the wind, but as the result of his long experience at sprinting, he would rather run with the wind than against it".

A prorating of 90% of the cost of the round trip railroad fare was made to the competitors and to coaches of teams of three or more men.

The following new N. C. A. A. records were made:

100-yard dash—G. S. Simpson (Ohio State University), 9.4 seconds.

220-yard dash—G. S. Simpson (Ohio State University), 20.8 seconds.

Pole Vault—R. W. Edmonds (Stanford University) and T. Warne (Northwestern University), 13 ft. 8 $\frac{7}{8}$ in.

Shot Put—H. Rothert (Stanford University), 50 ft. 3 in.

Discus Throw—P. A. Rasmus (Ohio State University), 159 ft. 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ in.

The individual winners in each event in the Eighth N. C. A. A. Track and Field Championships are as follows:

100-yard dash, won by G. S. Simpson, Ohio State University. Time 9.4 seconds. *New N. C. A. A. Record.*

220-yard dash, won by G. S. Simpson, Ohio State University. Time 20.8 seconds. *New N. C. A. A. Record.*

440-yard run, won by R. Walter, Northwestern University. Time 47.9 seconds.

880-yard run, won by E. B. Genung, University of Washington. Time 1:55.

One-mile run, won by W. C. Getz, Alfred University. Time 4:19.4.

Two-mile run, won by D. Abbott, University of Illinois. Time 9:30.

120-yard high hurdles, won by R. C. Rockaway, Ohio State University. Time 14.7 seconds.

220-yard low hurdles, won by S. Anderson, University of Washington. Time 23.5 seconds.

Field Events

Pole vault, won by R. W. Edmonds, Stanford University and T. Warne, Northwestern University. Height 13 ft. 8 $\frac{7}{8}$ in. *New N. C. A. A. Record.*

High jump, won by P. Shelby, University of Oklahoma. Height 6 ft. 3 in.

Broad jump, won by E. L. Gordon, University of Iowa. Distance 24 ft. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ in.

Shot put, won by H. Rothert, Stanford University. Distance 50 ft. 3 in. *New N. C. A. A. Record.*

Discus throw, won by P. A. Rasmus, Ohio State University. Distance 159 ft. 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ in. *New N. C. A. A. Record.*

Hammer throw, won by D. Gwinn, University of Pittsburgh. Distance 163 ft. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ in.

Javelin throw, won by J. P. Mortensen, University of Southern California. Distance 203 ft. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ in.

TRACK AND FIELD RECORDS

OF THE

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Below is a list of National Collegiate Athletic Association Track and Field Records. Of these, one was made in the first N. C. A. A. meet in 1921, one was made in the third N. C. A. A. meet in 1923, one was made in the fourth N. C. A. A. meet in 1925, one was made in the fifth N. C. A. A. meet in 1926, two

were made in the sixth N. C. A. A. meet in 1927, four were made in the seventh N. C. A. A. meet in 1928, and five were made in the eighth N. C. A. A. meet in 1929.

The holders of these records are as follows:

100-yard dash—G. S. Simpson (Ohio State University), 1929, 9.4 seconds.
 220-yard dash—G. S. Simpson (Ohio State University), 1929, 20.8 seconds.
 440-yard run—E. L. Spencer (Stanford University), 1928, 47.7 seconds.
 880-yard run—J. F. Sittig (University of Illinois), 1927, 1:54.2.
 One-mile run—R. Conger (Iowa State), 1927, 4:17.6.
 R. Kiser (University of Washington), 1928, 4:17.6.
 Two-mile run—D. Abbott (University of Illinois), 1928, 9:28.8.
 120-yard high hurdles—E. J. Thomson (Dartmouth College), 1921, 14.4 seconds.
 220-yard low hurdles—F. J. Cuhel (University of Iowa), 1928, 23.2 seconds.
 Pole vault—R. W. Edmonds (Stanford University), and T. Warne (Northwestern University), 1929, 13 ft. 8 $\frac{7}{8}$ in.
 High jump—W. C. Haggard (University of Texas), 1926, 6 ft. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ in.
 Broad jump—DeHart Hubbard (University of Michigan), 1925, 25 ft. 10 $\frac{7}{8}$ in.
 Shot put—H. Rothert (Stanford University), 1929, 50 ft. 3 in.
 Discus throw—P. A. Rasmus (Ohio State University), 1929, 159 ft. 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ in.
 Hammer throw—F. D. Tootell (Bowdoin College), 1923, 175 ft. 1 in.
 Javelin throw—L. Bartlett (Albion College), 1928, 216 ft. 7 in.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

OF THE

EIGHTH NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

TRACK AND FIELD MEET

Held at Stagg Field, University of Chicago, June 7 and 8, 1929

Receipts

Sale of Tickets	\$7,481.00
Sale of Programs	234.81
Concessions	24.61

TOTAL RECEIPTS	\$7,740.42
----------------------	------------

Expenditures

Printing:

900 entry blanks	\$27.00
Tickets, badges, contestants numbers	188.78
3000 programs	154.63
	<hr/>
	\$370.41

Publicity:		
500 postal cards	\$5.00	
Printing	4.25	
Stamps	14.00	
800 N. C. A. A. Envelopes	6.50	
		29.75
Medals		500.00
Ticket Sellers, guards, etc. (2 days)		143.25
Assistants in Dressing Quarters (2 days)		35.75
Dinner to coaches and managers		108.50
Dr. Monilaw, starter (2 days)		50.00
Telephone and telegrams		10.16
Miscellaneous items:		
Typist	\$4.13	
Express on Placque94	
N. C. A. A. Track and Field Guides		
1929	1.08	
Expenses regarding railroad rates	3.20	
		9.35
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		1,257.17
NET RECEIPTS		\$6,483.25
Withdrawn from the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Sinking Fund		695.51
Amount prorated for railroad fare on 90% basis		\$7,178.76

A. A. STAGG,
Chairman.

ADDRESSES

I. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

BRIG. GEN. PALMER E. PIERCE, RETD., U. S. ARMY

During the first quarter of this century the colleges of the United States have developed to its present condition the National Collegiate Athletic Association. In 1905 Dr. Mac Cracken, President of the College of the City of New York, called together representatives of some twenty-six colleges to consider the serious conditions of intercollegiate football. This preliminary conference was followed by another, held at the Murray Hill Hotel, New York City, December 28, 1905. Sixty eight colleges sent delegates to this meeting. There resulted the appointment of an Executive Committee consisting of Captain Palmer E. Pierce, West Point, Chairman, Professor H. D. Wild, Williams, and Louis Bevier, Jr., Rutgers, who were instructed to formulate a Constitution and By Laws for a proposed Intercollegiate Athletic Association. The Committee, under the authority granted it by the Conference, adopted a Constitution and By Laws for the permanent government of the Association, and published them March 31, 1906.

The first annual meeting of the Association so organized was held at Murray Hill Hotel, New York City, December 29, 1906. Forty colleges had by that time joined the Intercollegiate Athletic Association. The following resolution, similar to the one passed during the December 28, 1905 conference, was discussed and unanimously adopted:—

The Football Rules Committee for 1907 shall be composed of seven members and be directed to act as follows:

First. To communicate with the representatives of Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Annapolis, and Chicago Universities, who constituted the committee that formed the Football Rules Committee during 1905, and propose that the committees be amalgamated into one which shall formulate rules under which football shall be played during 1907.

Second: If this amalgamation be not accomplished, then the above named committee of seven shall proceed to formulate rules under which football shall be played by institutions enrolled in this Association.

Third: That the seven members elected by this conference shall be guided in their action so as to secure the following:

- (a) An open game.
- (b) Elimination of rough and brutal playing.
- (c) Definite and precise rules of play.

- (d) Organization and control of officials in order that the rules made shall be strictly and impartially enforced.

The Committee elected consisted of :

Chairman, Dr. H. L. Williams, University of Minnesota.

Members, Mr. E. K. Hall, Dartmouth,
Lieutenant Charles D. Daly, West Point,
Dr. C. W. Savage, Oberlin,
Dr. James A. Babbitt, Haverford College
Professor W. L. Dudley, Vanderbilt University,
Professor James T. Lees, University of Nebraska.

This Committee amalgamated, as had the one of the previous year, with the old football Rules Committee, and the relationships first established in 1906 continued until a reorganization was accomplished whereby all the members were elected annually as representatives of the Association.

During the first Annual Conference, Professor Bartlett of Dartmouth commended the Executive Committee "for the tact and discretion which they had used in forming the Association and accomplishing already a large work without rousing real antagonism. There is already," he said, "a higher amateur standard throughout the country. The remarkable amalgamation of the old Football Rules Committee marked a great triumph for the Association, resulting not so much in changing the rules, although in that respect a marked improvement has been made, but even more in a better public sentiment, in a higher grade of officials, and in general in a more sportsmanlike standard of fairness on the part of the players."

The President of the Association read to the delegates a letter from Mr. J. E. Sullivan, President of the Amateur Athletic Union, from which the following are extracts :

"I feel confident that if we go on as we have gone on in the past, the Amateur Athletic Union will within the next few years have alliances with athletic associations at home and throughout the entire world. This will strengthen the cause of amateur sport and we must look to the American colleges for coöperation. The time is not far distant when they will be forced by public opinion to control the college situation. From an athletic standpoint today the colleges lack organization. There is too much a desire on the part of each college to play in its own back-yard and go it alone. As a matter of fact, the only sport today at college which is properly conducted is that of field and track athletics, but it is only controlled in spots. We have the Intercollegiate A. A. A. composed of the largest colleges of America in the East. They control sport, track and field, but their right to claim control of college sports is disputed, as we have in the

Central West the Big Conference of Colleges controlling athletics among themselves and in a healthy manner. Then we have college organization in New England and the South. *But we have not a National Collegiate Athletic Association, and there should be one.*"

In answer to the question—"Is a national organization of the colleges and universities advisable?"—Mr. A. A. Stagg of Chicago University spoke earnestly in advocacy of a national organization. He stated such an organization could do much, in the first place, in exerting a salutary ethical influence, raising the standards of student athletic sports for honesty, fair play, and manliness.

I have called particular attention to the early history of our organization in order that you may fully realize its growth during the first twenty-five years of its existence. The membership has increased to more than two hundred; the playing rules committees, to twelve; the college athletic conferences or leagues, to approximately sixty, now covering the greater part of the United States; standards of sportsmanship and fair play are much higher; participation in athletic sports by undergraduates is three or four times greater; National Collegiate Athletic Association contests are now held annually in Track and Field, Swimming, and Wrestling; college athletic records are preserved, and athletics and sports are more a part of the general educational program.

If Mr. Sullivan were here today he would probably agree that the colleges have made great and satisfactory progress in organization and standards since 1905.

The history of the year's activities and developments are largely written in the reports of the Secretary-Treasurer, the Vice Presidents, and the chairmen of our various committees. Especial attention is called to those of the committees that conducted the various meets sponsored by the N. C. A. A. A reading of them should convince everyone of the growing influence of these games on standards of play and conduct.

The committees charged with the formulation of playing rules have carried on most satisfactorily during 1929. The football rules committee expects to complete the great task of the simplification and codification of their rules of play in 1930. The baseball committee is working for a set of rules applicable to educational institutions. The publications committee is still searching for satisfactory solutions of some of its complex problems.

It is reported that the rules of play prepared by our various committees, some in conjunction with representatives of other organizations, are coming more and more into general use.

During the business session reports will be received from various important special committees. Those appointed by the 23rd Annual Conference to consider relationships with the Amateur

Athletic Union and the American Olympic Association will report satisfactory progress. As to those with the Amateur Athletic Union, it may be said that there should be a great improvement due to the acceptance by that body of the principle of certification of undergraduate athletes by duly accredited educational institutions of the various districts into which the Union has divided this country. Whether or not any friction will develop in respect to the application of the somewhat complicated regulations will depend in large measure upon the spirit that animates the colleges and the district registration committees of the A. A. U.

A joint meeting of committees representing the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the American Olympic Association was held in this city Monday, December 30. Your committee presented suggested changes in the Constitution and By Laws of the American Olympic Association that it believed would simplify the organization, and make it more efficient and representative of the bodies promoting sports included in the program of the Olympic Games. It is hoped these suggestions will be given careful consideration and will result in a satisfactory reorganization at the Quadrennial Meeting of the American Olympic Association in 1930.

One of the important developments during the past year was the publication of the Carnegie Foundation Report on American College Athletics. Unfortunately it was issued too late for a thorough study to be made before this meeting. However, I asked the Nominating Committee, which is representative of the whole country, to make a preliminary report with recommendations for action, if any, to the Council, in the thought that that body might then decide on the steps to recommend to you as necessary to take full advantage of the facts developed by the investigation.

There is one passage in the Carnegie Report (page 240) that should give particular concern, and it is mentioned because the practice referred to is contrary to all the principles for which this Association has stood since 1906. It reads:

"The recruiting of American college athletes, be it active or passive, professional or non-professional, has reached the proportions of nationwide commerce. In spite of the efforts of not a few teachers and principals who have comprehended its dangers, its effect upon the character of the schoolboy has been *profoundly deleterious*. Its influence upon the nature and quality of American higher education has been no less noxious. The element that demoralizes is the subsidy, the monetary or material advantage that is used to attract the schoolboy athlete. It is seldom lacking in the general process of gathering 'a winning team'."

The article headed "Conclusion" (page 265) is noteworthy.

"The foregoing exposition attempts to penetrate the deepest shadow that darkens American college and school athletics. Probably portions of the picture are even blacker than they have been painted. Yet in the murk there are many brighter patches. The absence of recruiting and of subsidizing at many institutions, the integrity of the men who have struggled against these evils with varying degrees of success, the unassailable fact that neither subsidizing nor recruiting is essential to college sport, and the improvement that has been manifest in these particulars during the last quarter-century, should hearten anyone who is battling against the corruptions here shown or deplors these perversions of common honesty. This much is certain. The university or college that, under capable leadership, makes up its collective mind to cast out these practices, can do so. What is needed is constancy of purpose and patience in the face of opposition from those whose self-interest, false pride, and mistaken loyalties make their recession difficult.

Experience has shown that, of all who are involved in these evils—administrative officers, teachers, directors of athletics, coaches, alumni, undergraduates, and townsmen—the man who is the most likely to succeed in uprooting the evils of recruiting and subsidizing is the college president. It is his duty to coordinate opinion and direct the progress of an institution. If neighboring presidents are like-minded, his task is a little lightened, but under no circumstances which we have been able to discover is it impossible even if he stands alone. It cannot be easy. But such are the position and the powers of the American college president that, once having informed himself of the facts, and being possessed of the requisite ability and courage, he will succeed."

In this connection, permit me to read Article 5 of our Constitution.

"The members of this Association severally agree to supervise and, insofar as may be practicable, to control athletic sports so that they will be administered in accord with the law of amateurism and the principles of amateur sport set forth in this constitution, and to establish and preserve high standards of personal honor, eligibility, and fair play. The self-government of the constituent members shall not be interfered with or questioned."

In view of this provision, to which all our members have subscribed, is it possible that the following severe condemnation (page 226) of the Carnegie report is deserved?—

"If the individual colleges and universities that hold membership in the N. C. A. A. had sincerely accepted its definition of an amateur . . . and had conscientiously—or even to a reasonable extent—followed it, the abuses of recruiting, proselyting, and subsidizing would have disappeared over night. That they have not abated more, casts less discredit upon the N. C. A. A. than upon the individual members that are its members".

In view of the above, it seems desirable that this Association should provide for a thorough study of the Carnegie Survey of Athletics in American Colleges; that members reported as not controlling their athletic sports in accordance with the law of amateurism and the principles of amateur sport be conferred with confidentially, and that if the abuses are found to exist and no effort is being made to correct them, and there are no indications that such effort will be made, the offending institutions should be requested to resign from the N. C. A. A.

It seems to me that this Association would stultify itself by continuing in its membership colleges or universities notoriously indifferent to the obligation expressed in Article 5 of its Constitution.

The continued growth of this organization gives evidence of its increasing influence. Eleven colleges, seven athletic conferences, and one secondary school are seeking membership today.

The future of the N. C. A. A. seems assured. Although its organization is believed to be founded on correct principles, it is not yet complete. During the next twenty-five years of its existence the educational institutions of this country should fully develop the administration of their athletics so that they shall be truly a part of the general educational program and therefore under faculty control; that for the purpose of administering intercollegiate sports, they should all combine into local groups; that these groups should affiliate with this Association and become more influential in the conduct of its affairs; and that the N. C. A. A. should uphold the disciplinary measures of the local governing bodies.

This Association should continue to stand up for self-government in athletics. It should continue to maintain that athletic as well as civil governments derive "*their just powers from the consent of the governed*". The maintenance of this principle has undoubtedly caused friction and dissensions. However, many of the problems have been more or less completely and satisfactorily solved. The form of athletic government in the United States is still in a state of flux, and I believe that eventually some sort of a federation of the national sports governing bodies will develop.

Finally, I desire to express to the colleges of the country appreciation of the opportunity for worth while service given me. As

a result of the extraordinary conditions existing in 1905 I became imbued with the desirability of a national organization to deal with the problems incident to intercollegiate athletics. Shortly thereafter I became convinced that such an organization should encourage the adoption by our colleges of physical training and athletic sports as a part of the general educational program. During the past two and one half decades there have been accomplished, I believe, two noteworthy things:

- 1st—the formation of a permanent national athletic organization of colleges.
- 2nd—the general acceptance of two principles—
 - (a) that physical training and college sports should be a part of the educational program.
 - (b) that the faculties should be responsible for their proper development and control.

My thanks go out to the many fellow workers who have made these accomplishments possible. The greatest regret I have in retiring from active leadership of the Association is in the severance of many of the ties and relationships that will necessarily result.

II. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

PRESIDENT GUY H. VANDE BOGART, NORTHERN MONTANA SCHOOL

American education has undergone a series of remarkable changes in recent years. Current problems and existing conditions point to still more remarkable developments in the near future. It is to be expected that, with this progress in the more academic phases of education, our extra-curricular programs and policies must necessarily be modified in order to meet changing conditions. This is particularly true of an activity so universal as athletics in college and secondary school education, and so fundamentally important.

No development in our educational system has been more important, more cumulatively progressive, or has become more firmly established, than has the junior college. This institution, beginning in various forms nearly a century ago, has grown in numbers and in enrollments at an astonishing rate, particularly in recent years. As its functions have been better understood and as it has been found to meet very definite requirements, it has grown in favor with universities, colleges, and secondary schools alike. Some earlier opposition to the junior college is disappearing with the better understanding of its effectiveness in cooperating with other institutions. Incidentally, we may observe that although the junior college is regarded as an American institution, it has certain interesting resemblances to the German gymnasium and the French lycée.

As the junior college began to emerge many years ago from the mists of doubt, and as the outlines of its program and purposes stood out more and more clearly, there arose a series of problems, both academic and extra-curricular. The growing importance of one of these problems is evidenced by your interest in the question which we are to discuss at this time.

It is obviously unnecessary to present to this group arguments dealing with the value and importance of athletics as a part of the activities of our educational institutions, regardless of whether they are secondary schools or higher institutions. It would be equally superfluous to urge your support and encouragement of the athletic activities among these various types of institutions, in so far as this encouragement may be given without interfering with wholesome athletics, and with the academic welfare of the student as the primary consideration.

In order that we may acquaint ourselves briefly with the present situation in junior college athletics, I am presenting the following excerpts from a comprehensive study of this subject:

1. Sixty percent of those junior colleges that have athletics maintain three inter-school sports, or less, during the year.
2. Competition is chiefly junior college, although some games are played with small four-year colleges or with high schools.
3. There are 20 conferences in the United States, composed entirely, or largely, of junior colleges.
4. Athletes, like other students, in these institutions are chiefly local residents.
5. The average salary of the coaches is \$2300 per year.
6. Intra-mural programs are being developed to a moderate extent.

A complete report of this investigation will be published in the February, 1930, number of the *Athletic Journal*.

We may best sum up this matter by the following three observations:

1. Athletic programs of the junior colleges are, and will probably continue to be, comparatively limited.
2. Facilities for carrying on athletics are generally comparable to those of our high schools.
3. It is highly improbable that in most cases pretentious programs of athletics will be developed in the future because of the localized function of the junior college.

The problem of direct interest to us this morning is one which touches both the junior college and the higher institution, namely, the eligibility for intercollegiate competition of the student who has previously participated in junior college athletics. The discussion of this question is one that concerns all of us, inasmuch as every conference in the United States has, within the territory which its member institutions serve, a varying number of junior colleges. The vital importance of this problem to higher institutions is best indicated by the astonishingly rapid growth of these institutions, information upon which was obtained from the March, 1929, Directory of Junior Colleges of the United States, prepared by Doak S. Campbell, Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges, which lists a total of 405, distributed according to states as indicated on a map.

So recently have these new institutions come into existence in many places that provisions for solving the problem of athletic eligibility of their graduates have not yet been made, and as students enter the higher institutions they have been dealt with largely as individual cases. Even in those conferences in which regulatory measures have been discussed, there is frequently a marked lack of uniformity among the member institutions in the

conference as to the method of dealing with athletes who wish to participate in intercollegiate athletics. Instances have been reported in which large universities within the same conference appear to have placed a totally different interpretation upon the eligibility of students with precisely the same junior college athletic experience entering the several institutions. Cases of this kind have multiplied in recent years and will become more frequent with the growth of junior colleges, unless specific provision is made for these students.

Another phase of this problem of interest to all of us, whatever our function in educational work may be, is that of making such provisions as will recognize the primary importance of the educational welfare of the student. Here again may I draw upon my experience of the past several years in pointing out the fact that, with many students of excellent academic ability, athletic privileges will always be one of the considerations in their choice of a higher institution. Experience has indicated repeatedly that many students enter institutions in which they are assured of opportunities for athletics when they should logically have chosen another institution better suited to their individual needs.

These phases of the eligibility problem have been recognized by a large number of conferences, and the question is under discussion in several others at the present time. A study of forty-six college and university conferences of the United States, including a total membership of 452 institutions, was made during 1927-1928, and was published in the December, 1928, issue of the *Athletic Journal*. The policies of the various conferences were classified with reference to the two phases of eligibility which concern our discussion this morning. First, the period of residence required in the higher institution prior to intercollegiate competition may be classified under five types as follows:

1. Any junior college transfer eligible immediately.
2. Any junior college transfer matriculating with sophomore, or higher, classification eligible immediately.
3. Any junior college transfer matriculating with junior classification eligible immediately.
4. One semester or term of residence required prior to intercollegiate competition.
5. One year of residence required prior to intercollegiate competition.

The second consideration, that of the period of eligibility for intercollegiate competition, may be classified under four types:

1. Full competition, no deduction.
2. Deduct one year for all junior college competition.

3. Deduct number of years of junior college competition from four years.
4. Deduct number of years of junior college competition from three years.

The conferences of the United States have accordingly been grouped under this classification. (*The Athletic Journal*, December 1928, p. 15.)

In securing this information from the various conferences, it was found that in many cases no specific regulations have been made with reference to the junior college, but that the term "college" had been indiscriminately applied to all institutions giving work above the twelfth grade level. In other cases, particularly where the junior college movement has reached a more advanced stage of development, a distinction had been sharply drawn between the college and the junior college, or between those institutions offering work above the present high school level which offer degrees and those which do not offer degrees.

An extended investigation of the considerations which have influenced the discussion of this question among the junior colleges as well as among the higher institutions shows that in cases in which a distinction has been made between the man who enters a higher institution from a junior college and the man who transfers from one college to another the considerations are: first, the junior college compares much more closely with the secondary school than with the representative higher institution in coaching staff, schedules of games, and physical equipment. This situation has been definitely verified by the study referred to above. Second, the junior college is largely local in its educational service and influence. Third, higher institutions have recognized its value in cooperating with them, both in stimulating local interest in higher education and in providing additional students of good ability to enter the university or senior college as juniors. A final consideration, which is in its early beginnings, but which shows unmistakable signs of developing, is the tendency to combine the two years of junior college with the upper two years of the high school. Whether this plan will become general or not, it indicates a growing tendency in some parts of the United States to regard the junior college as a part of the secondary school. This fact is worthy of our definite consideration.

The junior college occupies a unique position in American education, as we have seen. It is set apart from colleges and universities both by the definitions placed upon it by accrediting agencies, and by its specific functions, as recognized by leaders in education. For this reason, a solution of our problem of the eligibility of its graduates may readily be found. It has been requested that a plan be presented at this time which may answer

the question of eligibility in those conferences which have not as yet adopted a policy in this matter.

In accordance with that request, I would suggest that, first of all, the fact be recognized that the junior college as an institution should be sharply distinguished from the four-year college. A number of our conferences have recognized this distinction, for we find in their constitutions and by-laws a sharply drawn line of demarcation between "junior colleges", "two-year colleges", "junior colleges and secondary schools", on the one hand, and "four-year colleges", "standard colleges", and "degree-granting institutions" on the other. A second fact which must precede a discussion of our plan is the close relationship in methods of work, interests, and affiliations, between the junior college and the eleventh and twelfth grades. A third and most important one is that the student who graduates from the junior college necessarily transfers to a higher institution, just as the student upon finishing high school must find further opportunity elsewhere for advanced work. In this case a definite distinction must be made between the student who transfers from a junior college at the close of his sophomore and final year of work in that institution as a matter of necessity.

We may approach a solution of the problem of eligibility of the student who enters a higher institution from a junior college by setting forth, first of all, four general considerations which may serve as criteria for measuring the effectiveness of regulations:

1. The regulations should prevent interference with the carefully and purposefully chosen academic program of the student.
2. They should tend to prevent proselyting of students from other institutions, or migration of students from other institutions because of athletic advantages.
3. They should eliminate material inducements to prospective students which are openly, or in effect, restricted to athletes.
4. They should permit the student to enjoy a period of athletic participation coincident with his normal progress toward graduation.

Various plans may be suggested which would satisfy these fundamental requirements of the various conferences. The general method of dealing with this question, which I am about to suggest, will be to the mutual advantage of the junior college and the higher institution.

In submitting a plan for determining the eligibility of the student entering from a junior college only two factors are involved. First, whether a period of residence shall be required prior to eligibility for intercollegiate athletics or not, and second, the number of seasons of varsity competition that shall be

allowed. With reference to the first, it is evident that the student is scholastically prepared for senior college work. He has passed the rather crucial freshman year and is more mature than is the boy who enters immediately after graduating from high school. There appears to be no reason why he should not be granted immediate eligibility, and that with junior standing scholastically he may not have the athletic privileges of a junior. It is highly improbable that those evils which were to be remedied by requiring a year of residence as a prerequisite to varsity eligibility will enter into the situation here. The experience of various conferences which have adopted a plan of this type has definitely proved the advisability of such regulations.

The period of participation should be correlated with the student's academic program, to the end that the number of seasons of varsity eligibility will correspond to the number of years remaining to him for completion of the usual college course.

This plan is suggested as a result of five years of rather careful study of the several questions involved in our discussion. The plan has been successful for many years in certain conferences, some of which are among the strongest in the United States, and in whose territories the junior college movement is well developed. It seems to be logical, free from misinterpretations, and generally workable. Some rather extensive correspondence recently indicates that this plan has won the favor of coaches, directors of athletics, and administrators. It seems to avoid those evils, insofar as our junior college graduates are concerned, which our conference regulations are designed to prevent.

In offering this general plan I am aware that various modifications may be found advisable in the future as in the past. These may be desired both by the junior colleges and by the higher institutions. But at least it offers a general policy that has been tried and found successful. From the standpoint of the student this procedure affords an opportunity to enjoy this, as well as other extra-curricular activities to which he feels that he is logically entitled. Those in charge of athletics in the higher institutions find the junior college graduate entering the higher institution with maturity, with definite purposes, and eager to participate in the athletic activities which interest him. From the standpoint of the administrator, whether in the junior college or in the college, that major problem, the educational guidance of the student, is very greatly simplified.

Under present conditions in certain conferences we have the paradoxical situation of the academic departments of the colleges and universities offering excellent assistance and coöperation to the junior colleges, while the athletic departments, evidently following somewhat archaic regulations dating back before the advent of the junior college, or because of the failure to understand the potential value to them of the junior college graduate,

are still insisting upon a dormant year for juniors, thus practically denying varsity athletic privileges during their senior college course.

I consider it a privilege to have been invited to present information to you relative to this problem which already has become important enough to merit careful consideration and specific provisions by a large number of conferences, a problem which within the next few years will be an outstanding one in its importance, and a problem which I trust may be carefully studied and thoroughly understood in order that we may all recognize the distinction between provisions which apply to colleges and universities and which have been made necessary in the interest of good athletics, and provisions which, if applied en masse to junior colleges, would discourage their athletic programs and would work an unnecessary and undeserved hardship upon the boy who attends the junior college and later enters the university, hoping to enjoy its athletic as well as its educational advantages, to both of which it would seem that he is justly entitled.

III. ASPECTS OF THE RELATION OF EDUCATION TO COLLEGE SPORT

DR. HOWARD J. SAVAGE, CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

The privilege of attending this meeting is increased by the fact that it was a group from the National Collegiate Athletic Association that, in January, 1926, applied the final push before the Carnegie Foundation began its exploratory voyage in American college athletics. The results of that exploration have already been published, and we hope that all of you have had opportunity to examine Bulletin Number Twenty-three. Doubtless the fact that the Bulletin came out in the midst of the biggest football season the country has ever known had an effect upon its reception. But after all, Bulletin Number Twenty-three pertains less to sport than to education, and the season of the year in which it was released will have little effect upon whatever results flow from it in the long run.

We have been asked rather frequently what we think these results will be. No means are at hand for gauging the ultimate effect of the study. If it hastens certain important tendencies that are now shaping themselves rather definitely, it will have served a worthy ultimate purpose. Concerning immediate and practical results that have become evident since the day of publication, it is possible to speak with more certainty, although in general terms. Of these, the most encouraging is that, since our enquiry began, a number of universities and colleges have scanned their athletic situations and attempted, usually very successfully, to improve them. In many such cases, we have been happy to afford what aid we could.

When a university or a college enters upon what is commonly known as a self-survey of any phase of its activity, the first great needs are critical detachment and the open mind. Without these qualities the project is likely to be twisted to serve the purposes of institutional self-justification. For a self-survey of athletics at any institution, what is especially needed is constancy and patience in the face of opposition from those whose self-interest, false pride, and mistaken loyalties make their recession from positions already taken both difficult and humiliating. Meanwhile, further information concerning the athletic situation both in the country and also at individual colleges and universities continues to come to us. Although in the main it is unsolicited, it is none the less gratefully received. We hope that we are putting it to good uses.

Since the appearance of the Bulletin, certain critics have expressed regret that it is not what they term a "constructive report." We gather that what is really meant is that the study proposes no formula,—no self-starting, gyroscopically-controlled

program which, merely by being talked about, can change overnight the future development of American college athletics. Anyone who looks for such a formula in Bulletin Number Twenty-three is predestined to disappointment. Those college presidents, directors of physical education, alumni, coaches, and other friends of athletics, who have wrestled, sometimes singlehanded, with the problems in human relationships that college athletics involve, and who have taken the time from busy days and nights to consider this matter thoroughly in terms of their own institutions, well known that no such magic formula exists. There are many such men in this room to-day. All of them have faced very great difficulties in the past. Some have overcome these difficulties. Their efforts are beyond praise or price. Others have been forced to defer further efforts until more propitious times. Still others, becoming discouraged, have felt the odds against them to be too heavy. We have tried to show in Bulletin Number Twenty-three that at no university we visited for our enquiry are athletics not worth bettering. They are worth bettering partly because of the efforts that many of you have expended upon them in the past, and the fact that they are so well conducted at numerous colleges to-day. Although much remains to be done, the changes for good that many of you have wrought during the last decade and more are too valuable to be allowed to be buried under tendencies which all recognize to be dangerous and which, if uncorrected, will in time nullify the very great services that sport can be made to render to American higher education.

The question of "constructive" reports has another side. Numbers of "constructive" reports, with whatever they have dealt, have been whitewashing documents. This has been especially true of the field of education. Now, the American public has nothing to be ashamed of in its support of education, and its efforts since 1636 have borne very great fruits. Its true leaders welcome any sincere and reasoned effort to improve our educational structure by the correction of defective details. Not so the educational demagogue. His stock in trade is the flattery with which he attempts to lull a portion of the public into complacency, and he is all too ready to rush unsolicited to the defense of anything that furthers this result. He therefore welcomes the whitewashing document. Although Bulletin Number Twenty-three has been censured as being too polite, restrained, and anxious to please, it is not a "constructive" report in the sense of being a whitewashing report, even though we have not set forth in it all of the disagreeable facts that are documented and otherwise substantiated in our files. We are indebted to a gathering of the National Collegiate Athletic Association for its encouragement to mention institutions by name in the Bulletin. So far as we are aware, no previous document in the field has referred specifically to individual institutions and practices. We do not

know how any publication of this nature might justly go further than ours has gone.

In the confusion of commentary that the Bulletin called forth, one note may be selected for a few words. It was frequently said, "This study is probably all right in general. It is only natural that there should be errors of detail." This, of course, is a comforting reflection. Yet we have devoted the utmost care to detailed accuracy because we felt, and still feel, that the worth of any such enquiry depends primarily upon the trustworthiness of its details. Up to the present hour, we have not been apprised of any inaccuracy in the study as printed, and no one who has charged it with inaccuracy, after doing us the honor to read it, has substantiated his statement. Accuracy and detachment have been the aims of the Foundation's other studies,—medical education, engineering education, legal education, dental education, and the relationships existing between the secondary school and the college. Why not, then, in the Foundation's athletic enquiry? To those administrative and athletic officers who approved, corrected, or brought up to date the facts transmitted in our communications of April 17, 1929, to presiding officers of co-operating universities and colleges, our study owes much in the way of accuracy. With some of our inferences from these facts we expect and welcome differences of opinion, but with the fundamentals of the enquiry, documentary and otherwise, from which these inferences were drawn there can, we think, be no real quarrel.

So much for the matters of detail connected with the reception of Bulletin Number Twenty-three. Let us now examine certain matters of larger import.

The question of responsibility for the conduct of college athletics has two phases, the legal and the practical. On the legal aspects of the matter, I cannot pretend to speak with any authority, but in a recent study of *State Control of Private Incorporated Institutions of Higher Education*, after examining the charters of numerous colleges and universities, the authors conclude that, once corporate powers have been vested by a legislative body in a board of trustees, "States maintain little or no control by limiting educational institutions in the matter of property, admissions, courses, staffs, or degrees." In short, it appears that the trustees of an institution of higher education are, so to speak, "on their own." Their responsibility is to the legislative body that vested them with their privileges and powers, and through it to the State and its citizens.

Manifestly, it is impractical for any body of trustees, the members of which have other occupations, to conduct the affairs of a college or university without delegating their powers. The practical and, as far as I know, universal method is to delegate these powers to committees of trustees, to faculties, to administrative

officers such as deans, and especially to the president. Although much has been written about the duties, status, and functions of the American college president, his administrative powers and responsibilities have not yet been sharply defined. The instructional and disciplinary functions of faculties are probably on the whole much more clearly comprehended.

However this may be, a careful study of the situation would probably show that the ultimate legal responsibilities for college athletics devolve upon the trustees of the institution, but the immediate, practical responsibility rests with its president and faculty, who in turn are accountable to the trustees and thus to the general public. For this reason, it is the presidents and faculties of our colleges that the public must hold accountable for beneficial changes in our college athletics.

Now, what direct bearing has this matter of presidential and faculty responsibility for athletics upon our problems? We turn to one or two of the more important phases.

In the first place, I think I am right in saying that, the country over, the general rule holds good that the quality of college sport at any given institution very quickly reflects the interest or the lack of concern of the presiding officer. By interest I do not mean the dallying with the superficial which leads only to the president's attending a few meets or games and addressing "pep" rallies. I mean a sincere concern with the relations of the inherent or putative values of college sport to the whole function of the college or university. Although these values may be ticketed as ethical, moral, and physical, nevertheless their immediate aspects are less formal. Only when they are seen in due relation to the life and honor of the individual institution are they adequately comprehended. And only when they are thus understood can they be so acted upon as to serve the best interests of the youths whom they ultimately affect.

At the moment, there is much confusion over the relation of college sport to what we are fond of referring to as "educational democracy." By more than one writer it is held that if a considered attempt is made to cast out athletic subsidies the result must be disastrous to those democratic qualities of American education which are dear to all of us. This attitude is frequently invoked to justify the pursuit of college athletics for gain by young men who should be devoting their major efforts to the training of their intellectual faculties. It is not surprising that the term "educational democracy" has proved to be one of the trickiest catchwords of the educational demagogue. The plain truth is that the brand of educational democracy to which the recruiting and subsidizing of athletes contribute is unworthy of an institution of higher learning. The sense in which the term is constantly employed, very often as a cloak for the most unfortunate ulterior motives, is far from its true meaning. Rightly

understood, democracy in education denotes that characteristic of our educational process which vouchsafes to each and sundry equal opportunities to develop his habits and powers of the mind, the body, or the spirit, in accordance with his capacities. Subsidizing seriously impairs not alone the incentive but also the privilege of every student, whether or not in receipt of a subsidy, to develop his capacities to the full. The man who uses his athletic talent with a view to financial return, especially in undergraduate days, possesses an advantage over his less skillful fellows which impairs the natural rights of the whole group, in order to advance special and exclusive privilege.

One of the best results of what has been known as the American theory of education has been a universal decline in class distinctions. In this decline sport has certainly played a not unimportant part. It were well if this fact led to a recognition that, of all human attributes, none is so democratic in the best sense as intelligence.

No system of college athletics at any institution can be regarded as bearing a just relation to the educational process unless it is conducted primarily for the benefit and the happiness of the undergraduates. Too many highly developed institutional programs have been bent, whether at their inception or later when profits have poured in, to exploit students for the diversion of graduates, the enrichment of local merchants, the financial benefit of a building program, or the amusement of the general public. The excuse so often advanced that intercollegiate football must be made to show a profit if undergraduates are to enjoy the best results of intramural athletics focuses upon this problem. If intercollegiate sports contain the educational possibilities so often attributed to them, they will be the stronger if, for our present lavish expenditure, is substituted a modesty of program, a real economy of equipment and provision, and above all that interest on the part of alertly minded youth which a greater responsibility for details of management and play alone can bring.

Nor are the "physical, mental, and moral" benefits obtainable from athletics the only values which the undergraduate ought to be led to expect as returns from participation. Sports have their lighter side. There should be fun in playing any game and recreation in any contest that is worthy of the name sport. May the American college be forever saved from the day when its undergraduates play games only to develop themselves and their opponents "mentally, morally, and physically!"

The fact seems to be that, in order to justify the expansion of college athletics to their present proportions in our educational program, we feel that we must substitute for their immediate returns in recreation and fun a list of shadowy and formal "objectives." Fortunately, the undergraduate, with his growing appreciation of the importance of the intellectual aspects of college life and his insistence that he be permitted to enjoy his

games, is himself pointing the way to simpler and less formalized recreations. It requires no gift of prophecy to perceive that the type of athletic competition that is not essentially good sport cannot survive the next two decades. American college life will be the richer without it.

If the purpose of the Carnegie Foundation's athletic enquiries were to shed light only upon school and college sport, neither the Foundation's interest nor its endeavors would be justified. Seen in a due perspective, the American athletic study, as well as the British study is only a part of a far larger range of enquiry which may be described, somewhat vaguely to be sure, as pertaining to the principles operative in the evolution of the American university.

To judge from almost daily manifestations, the American university, after nearly three centuries of life, has not yet reached anything like final development. This fact need not astonish, although its implications may. The Oxford of Sir Thomas More and the Paris of Erasmus were far removed from the English and continental universities of our own day.

Academic life moves more rapidly in our age and country than ever it moved in the past. Whereas a curriculum, an instructional or administrative procedure, or a group of magnificent buildings can nowadays be summoned as if by the Golden Lamp of Aladdin, tried and found wanting, or approved in a college generation, it requires centuries to establish certain principles of teaching that to-day underlie scholarship at the continental universities, English universities, or our own elder universities or colleges. Many of our modern questionings were answered in different but equivalent terms by the patient devotion of the Middle Ages. The problems that confront those who have at heart the welfare of the American university are not bound by the present or the next few years; they involve a long future and its educational relationship to the life of a nation as yet comparatively young. The best university administrator or scholar of to-day will be adjudged by his successors to be he who penetrated that future so faithfully as to leave least to be replaced in that portion of the whole structure, whatever its ultimate form, that survives his own brief years.

Clearly, in our present-day college athletics changes are needed. The American college or university cannot serve all causes, however worthy they may appear at the moment. Already it may have been enlisted in too many. The defense of its intellectual integrity lies with its president and faculty, and with them also rests the authority of both its present and its future. Theirs, therefore, is the responsibility to bring college sport into a sincere relation to the intellectual life of the university. The larger need of to-day is to scrutinize anew our educational heritage and processes in the light of the sincerity and the honest thoroughness that characterizes a true university, old or young.

IV. THE CHALLENGE OF THE CARNEGIE REPORT

PRESIDENT FRANK PARKER DAY, UNION COLLEGE

I feel that it is a great honour to be asked to make this speech on such an important subject before such an important society, but while my vanity has been flattered by Dean Nicolson's invitation, I have suffered since my acceptance a good many qualms of spirit. I realized that, as an intense lover of games myself, I was not clear as to what kind of an athletic situation I wanted; I found myself carrying water upon both my mental shoulders—I encourage the students to excel in whatever they undertake; how can I hope that they will excel if I in any way remove the means of their excelling? I have moreover realized that I may get myself into trouble through this speech, and that I may offend some of the loyal alumni of my college. I have been president of a college for such a short time that I wrote Dean Nicolson in accepting that I felt like a fledgling leaving the nest on untried wing. Moreover this has been such an eventful year for me and so crowded with new projects, that I feel like exclaiming with Falstaff: "There is not a dangerous action can peep out his head, but I am thrust upon it." However, Father Daedalus in the person of Dean Nicolson has launched young Icarus into midair, the sun is hot, already the wax that binds wings to shoulders is melting, and far below me I catch glimpses of the deep blue Icarian Sea.

College athletics is a subject upon which people are peculiarly sensitive, and it has been a stumbling block for many presidents and administrators of colleges. We have now presented to us, however, by impartial judges, namely the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, this momentous Report on American College Athletics, and it reveals beyond doubt that we are in a parlous state. We all know perfectly well that, while there may be some possible errors in the matter of detail, the report is substantially true. In fact those of us who know something about athletics realize further that it is very moderate in its statement. There have been many defences published in various alumni magazines, but none that I have read does more than pick at some petty details without facing the great problem. Let us assume then that it is true and moderate, and that it reveals but a portion of the scandals of our athletic life.

The question before us is what are we going to do about it. Football, of course, is the main concern. Football has grown from simple things into such vast proportions. President Britt in the *Knox Alumnus* quotes from a Knox publication of the eighties: "Last night a football meeting was held in old Main. It was decided to attempt to organize a team. At the close of the meeting a collection was taken up for the purpose of buying a football." From such small beginnings, we have with us now

the highly paid coach, well trained teams, in many cases partly professional, huge stadia, where on Saturdays of autumn great crowds come for holiday entertainment. Large sums of money are taken at the gate, and a great deal spent upon the training, equipment, and travel of the participating athletes. It has grown like a sapling a man has planted close to his house, which he suddenly finds a huge overshadowing elm, that shuts out the light from his dwelling. He stands looking at the great tree in perplexity. It has a fine strong trunk, great roots, spreading branches, and healthy foliage. But the great tree makes his house both dark and damp. The tree is in itself both good and beautiful. What shall he do about it? Shall he attempt to destroy it root and branch? Or merely prune and lop off some of the branches in the hope that the sun's rays may shine through? He cannot understand how the tree has grown so fast; the sapling was so slender at first. The great tree planted for ornamentation and healthful shade has become a menace to his dwelling place.

We today are in exactly the position of the man standing before the great tree, the tree being, of course, Organized Athletics. For on the whole I believe, as you all do, that athletics are essentially sound, and that they have only darkened and dampened our academic dwellings because we have allowed the tree to grow through the years without the care of the pruning hook. What shall we do with this great tree? Shall we cut it down and burn it? Shall we attempt to lop off branches? Or shall we at the risk of almost incalculable labor dig it up and transplant it to some place where its shade may be less harmful and plant in its place shrubberies, that add beauty and fragrance to our life without denying our dwellings the light of the sun?

There are two courses open to us,—one is to go on as we are going, to build more and larger stadia, to engage higher and higher priced coaches, to afford finer and finer spectacles to the public, to drift with the tide, and to still further impair the intellectual life of our colleges. The other path before us is to do something that will lead us in another direction, into quieter and more peaceful places. But what is that something we should try to do? When I think of the vast paraphernalia in this country, of the already established conditions of football in the minds of youth, the numerous stadia now built or being built, of crowded special trains full of shouting undergraduates, of all those interested in making money out of athletics, of great universities emptied of their student bodies on a Saturday afternoon, left tenantless, like Keats's village on a Grecian Urn, when I remember my own youthful enthusiasm for games, and how even in middle life I am thrilled by the pageantry of the great shouting crowd, and by the gallantry and sportsmanship displayed by young athletes, it seems hopeless to offer any proposal to combat the evils of such a vast system. I stand again like the man whose

house has been made damp and dreary by the great overshadowing tree, fearful to hack into it. The tree may fall upon me and overwhelm both me and my dwelling. In attacking such a vast system I feel like little David going down into the valley upon the opposing slope of which stands a gigantic opponent. My sling is totally inadequate. I have no confidence that there will be any suitable pebbles in the brook-bottom, nor that if I should find such a pebble, smooth and shapely, that it would find lodgement in the forehead of the great giant. For one such stone that found its mark in legend or history there have been a thousand little Davids who perished as a result of their own temerity. Nor even should the giant come thundering down, on the impact of my brook-worn pebble, am I sure that I should have the courage to rush forward, cut off his head, and hold it up dripping before the assembled hosts.

What is the something that we must try and do? In the first place we must decide whether we want our college and university teams to be truly amateur or semi-professional. It is quite obvious that we have not been at one on this matter. In fact some down-right and honest-minded enthusiasts have stated that it does not matter whether amateur or professionals play on our college teams as long as the participants are *bona fide* students maintaining a standard. An amateur, I take it, is a man who plays games because he enjoys them and because he neither gets nor hopes to get any material or monetary value or subsidy of any kind from the participation,—nothing except the sheer joy of competition and the delight of well coördinated physical effort. A professional, I take it, is a man who also enjoys games but has a further interest in the game besides the joy of playing in that he hopes either to receive money for his participation or to be maintained in college, or to receive some other form of benefit therefrom. I suppose that roughly differentiates the amateur from the professional. I take it for granted that the old point of view, namely, that it does not matter whether the man is professional or amateur on our college teams, has gone out of fashion. We are all pretending that we have amateur teams, and I take it for granted from that pretense that the ideal before us is that we should have amateur teams. The Carnegie Report shows clearly that a great many of our teams and probably the great majority are not in any sense truly amateur, and that our athletics are riddled with pretense, hypocrisy, double-dealing, and deceit. With these matters the process of education can have no partnership, though we all believe that participation in sport can be of greatest value in building character and a sense of comradeship in youth.

What ugly branches must we lop off from our great tree so that the light of heaven may again shine through! We find the phrase ringing in our ears, "The love of money is the root of all

evil." We have in America a habit of capitalizing all our fine sentiments. The florist capitalizes the spirit of Mother's Day, and asks us to "say it with flowers," at a handsome price; the hotel-keeper and shopkeeper capitalize the spirit of Christmas, and with a smile invite us to do things or buy things we cannot afford.

In this vast athletic venture in which we are engaged we have capitalized the spirit of young men to make a vast show for the public. The love of money is the root of all evil. Our college athletics are no longer college affairs, they are spectacles for the public, a public a large part of which has no college affiliation, and often no special knowledge of the game which is being played. I have sometimes had good luck and sometimes very bad luck in being allotted a seat at a big game. Sometimes I have sat with quiet orderly people who watched with interest and who obviously understood what was going on. On another occasion when two of the biggest teams in the country participated I had very bad luck. On this occasion I persuaded my wife who enjoys neither vast crowds nor football to come along with me, as two of the leading teams in America were competing. Everyone in our section seemed to be drunk; the men in the front row hardly watched the game at all, but stood up throughout the contest with their backs to the game, and acted as cheer leaders for their maudlin comrades, while at the same time they completely obscured both for me and everybody else the players on the field. Three times men came to me and asked me to hold large sums of money which they had bet with one another. To cap the afternoon the man immediately in front of us was sick, and eventually fell over and went to sleep. There were cries of "Robber!" and "Kill the umpire!" on the occasion of penalties. This I am not adducing as a picture of a typical audience. It was the picture of the worst audience in which I have ever sat, but it was none the less a real and actual audience, and for such as these our college boys were presenting a Roman holiday.

The other night I had to listen to an announcer describing some game in California, and these are some of the phrases I caught. "Smith broke through, but Jones got him and got him good; looks to me as if he socked him in the neck." "That boy Jones is a good one, he is a phenomena." "Jones broke through and smeared Smith. I guess that boy must be a shot-putter. He threw Smith about fifteen feet, and tore the shirt right off him." When I protested to the very polite man in charge of the radio at my end against the vulgarity and degradation of such announcements, he said to me very politely, but firmly, "This announcing is not being made for college presidents, and professors of literature, but for the great American public that loves such detail."

Now I cannot help but think that there is a great American public that detests such detail, and that was moved to the same

disgust that I was, at the degrading influence of such sport announcement. It in no way differed from the stock description of a prize fight. I believe, therefore, that we should make an effort, difficult and hopeless as it may seem, to prevent our college athletics from being vulgarized and from becoming more and more public spectacles, and that we should endeavor to return to some simpler method of athletic life. In some way we must get rid of the incubus of money. If we continue to make money as we are doing at present with our games we will go further and further along the path that we are now following. For if we continue to make more money we will spend more money. Strangely enough there are many people who attend these great pageants merely because it is fashionable, because of the great crowd, because of the excitement that prevails, who have little knowledge and interest in the game itself. They know nothing of the athlete's tingling delight in life, of brain divinely knit to limb. Now how are we to avoid becoming more and more a public spectacle? How are we to get rid of the yelling crowd thirsting for violence and rough play?

I am of course not wise enough to answer the question adequately. I believe that the rough professional coach is almost out of fashion, though many still persist—men with no idea beyond perfecting a fine football machine, jockeying schedules, winning games, establishing a reputation, and affording a spectacle to the multitude. The grim seriousness of such men has been transmitted to the players and much of the fun has been squeezed out of football by their efforts. Here is a clipping I cut from a Chicago paper a few weeks ago: "There was no 'singing in the rain' yesterday as Northwestern's grid warriors began preparations for the season's finale with Notre Dame at Dyche stadium Saturday. It was a grim set of youths who assembled in a drizzling rain and went through a routing drill on fundamentals, the improper execution of which cost them a victory against Indiana last Saturday."

The coaches I have known, Mr. Roper of Princeton, slightly, and more intimately Judge Steffens of Carnegie Institute of Technology, Dr. Mercer of Swarthmore, and Mr. Leary of Union, are all fine high-minded men who could be as unwilling to have anything to do with dishonesty, double-dealing, or corruption of youth, as anyone here present. It is no good shouldering the blame upon coaches or graduate managers. We, the administrators of colleges, must take the burden upon our own shoulders.

Here is what we might attempt: first, to have no gate fee to our games and to admit by invitation, second, to do away with high-priced seasonal coaches, third, to ban all scouting, subsidizing, and proselytizing, and see to it strictly in our own circle that no undergraduate in college or university receives material gain and is appointed to any position simply because he is an ath-

lete on a team. We must not go so far, however, as to hamper the athlete, for we all know that the more *bona fide* student athletes we have in a college, the finer and stronger the life of the college.

Perhaps we can hope to work out of this seemingly hopeless muddle by some course of positive rather than negative action. A good many undergraduates in colleges feel that it is unjust that they should be taxed yearly in order that thirty or forty highly-selected athletes should be trained by a highly-paid coach to meet the highly-selected athletes of some other college. They resent, too, being dragged every Saturday afternoon to the stadium to show their spirit by shouting themselves hoarse. Many of them would prefer to read or to engage in games themselves rather than to be mere onlookers. This growing spirit, I believe, should be encouraged. In some of the small colleges we are going further and further in the direction of intra-mural athletics. At a small college like Union, for instance, where we take 800 men, I should like to see 800 men at play between three and five every afternoon. Amateur athletics can have a real educational value in the building of men, and we should have room enough in our gymnasiums, tennis courts, playing fields, for any student who wishes to take exercise and indulge in games any afternoon. Instead of a crowd of onlookers, we need crowds of players.

Of course it is very difficult to see how the big universities that have built or are building stadia and are under the necessity of paying interest on their bonded indebtedness for construction, can retrace their steps without a serious loss of money. I have been hoping for some years that the big and well-established universities in the east, like Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, would lead the way out of this athletic maze in which we are now wandering. There seems to be no sign of this however, and it was with a sinking heart that I recently read in the paper that the great University of Columbia had engaged an \$18,000 coach to train her squad of football players.

It is just possible that some of the athletic evils might be cured by regarding the situation from the point of view of localities rather than by endeavoring to make regulations for the whole country. Perhaps the smaller colleges might show the way. In our locality in central and northern New York and the New England states it might, for instance, be possible to do away with paid coaches, or at any rate, as has been proposed, to have a director of athletics and assistants who would be members of the faculty, receiving a salary comparable to that of other members of the college, and thus form a truly amateur college league. I should like very much to see such a league beginning with the nucleus of Hamilton, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Williams, Amherst, Wesleyan, and Union, all colleges of high academic standing and of about the same athletic strength. It seems to me

that it is bad sportsmanship for the teams of these smaller colleges to engage in games which are mere matters of practice for the big universities but serious matters of life and limb for the small colleges. Again, it is a matter of money. Big colleges pay a handsome guarantee for which the small colleges are willing to endure a thorough drubbing, but in other sporting matters we do not proceed in this way, and match a famous heavy-weight against an almost unknown light-weight.

If such truly amateur leagues could be formed among small colleges such as I have named, and others, that are eligible because of their standing and geographical propinquity, much good in the way of example might come from it for the great universities. The members of such leagues might compete in all games,—football, track, baseball, lacrosse, swimming, tennis, hockey, and association football.

I for one will be glad to negotiate with nearby colleges of good academic standing and similar athletic strength for the formation of such a league, and I shall be glad to vouch personally for the amateur standing of our teams. At Union we give scholarships only to scholars, though we are glad when these scholars have participated in school activities and are interested in games, and this we state frankly on our scholarship blanks. To argue that the Rhodes scholars are chosen because of their athletic ability is pure piffle. I have sat on the election board of two states for a number of years, and know that Rhodes scholars are chosen because of scholarship, character, and good sportsmanship, which is another name for character.

I should very much like to see the football and other teams of such a league coached by an old graduate of the college who coached for the pure love of sport and because of his interest in helping to develop young men. I do not think we can copy the English method, nor do I think their athletics except in the department of rowing are as highly developed as ours. But even in this department in which they excel, I was very much pleased to find this summer on visiting Oxford that the Varsity crew and the trial crew were coached by Gladstone and Barker, with both of whom I had rowed over twenty years ago. The objection that will be raised to amateur coaching, of course, is that old graduates have neither time nor leisure for this work. Surely that cannot be true. America is by far the richest country in the world, and I believe that if we began to develop this system of amateur coaching we would find many men who would be able and eager to do it. A college is very fortunate when the members of the faculty are able and willing to coach the various teams. At Union the tennis team is coached by the head of the civil engineering department, the Varsity hockey team by the professor of philosophy, the freshman hockey team by the professor of religious instruction. This may make you smile and you may

decide that my idea of athletics is an old woman's idea but whether the idea is simple or not, it is at any rate not dishonest.

I grant you that our teams would not be so good under this system of amateur coaching, but I do not think that matters very much, although in America we have a burning desire to do well in athletics. I have been wondering what the effect of this Carnegie Report, with its story of subsidies, dishonesty, and double-dealing, will have upon the minds of other nations. It will doubtless find its way abroad and reveal to foreign people the trickery of our athletics. Is it not possible that they may become strangely suspicious of our athletes who have come up under such a system and who wish to compete in the Olympic games? As Americans we are very jealous of our good name, we do not like to have our honour impugned, nor to be regarded as hypocrites, pretending to do one thing and actually doing another. Surely some Moses must arise to lead us out of this desert in which we have been wandering and to take us into the Promised Land of Amateur Athletics.

Not only have many boys in colleges been corrupted, but the evil has permeated into the secondary schools, and the school boys have been encouraged by many athletic directors to find out what colleges or universities will give the most for the goods they have to offer. If this were done openly it would be bad enough, but it is done with secrecy and covered up with lies and hypocrisy. The school boy athlete, therefore, and many of these athletes are boys with foreign names, are taught bad and dishonest methods, and as in their youthful period they are more interested in athletics than in anything else, these methods of sham, and hypocrisy, and double-dealing become a real part of their natures that no amount of education in the future will ever completely eradicate.

I am still old-fashioned enough to regard myself as acting *in loco parentis* for the young men in Union College. In the midst of all the confusion of athletics, of arranging curricula, and of adjusting salaries, I never can forget that the 800 boys under my jurisdiction have been sent here by parents who love them, and who wish to see as fine men as possible made of their children. I imagine most college executives feel that way. Now in that process of education by which we hope to turn out every year right-minded young men who can be of some service to themselves and to the state, we can have no partnership with wrongdoing. Everyone knows that the real principle of morals, by which life is only possible, is truthfulness and upright dealing. You and I have boys in college or boys soon entering college, and you all know what hopes we have for them in our own hearts. We should have the same hopes for the children of other people. Four years in college are valuable years and should not be wasted, and if we are not seeing to it that in those four years the greatest number of boys are being developed physically, intellectually, and

morally, then no matter how grand we may appear we are simply not doing our job. I cannot expect that these remarks of mine will be popular with people who are drawing salaries of \$20,000 for engaging in athletics, nor with alumni who believe that a college is promoted by the excellence of its athletic teams at any cost, nor by the multitude for whom the college games are staged. Nor can I hope that these remarks of mine will have much effect. Again, like little David, I take up my ill-shapen pebble and shoot, but make no dent upon the forehead of the giant, and I am answered only by a roar of Gargantuan laughter. I do propose, however, the following suggestions for your consideration:

First, that we stop making money and do away with gate receipts. Second, that we give up professional coaching, scouting, subsidizing, directing from the sidelines, and come back to amateur coaching. Third, that leagues be formed among local colleges that wish to play truly amateur athletics. And fourth, that no compensation of any kind whatsoever be given to college players who participate in stadium games. Fifth, that all our athletic dealings be open and aboveboard, and in the full light of day, and that our ideal be to give every student in college a chance to participate in athletics. Let us ask ourselves what we would do if we were starting fresh with no athletic traditions and had an open field before us.

Should some critic of this paper ask: "Where is Union College and who is the president thereof?" the answer is that Union College is a small college of eight hundred undergraduates at Schenectady, N. Y., that has resisted the temptation to grow large, and the president is nobody in particular. I am not conceited enough to think that in this adventurous flight I have said anything original nor pursued things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme; I have merely echoed the thought of hundreds of other people.

In conclusion let me say that the burden of righting what is wrong rests upon us who are college executives. We are largely to blame. It is not enough that we set the post-prandial table in a roar with tales of the inadequate examination answers of our football heroes. We are largely to blame. Our curricula are often so dull and stilted that our students rush into their own activities to find the zest and reality of life. We have connived with pious show in thrusting upon them systems of medieval philosophy that an intelligent child of fourteen laughs to scorn. Colleges and universities should prepare boys for the actual life around them, and cultivate what ideals and hopes we can for the future. The students know we are not doing well, and it is a sad reality that a great football coach has more influence upon the undergraduate mind than a president. We must be up and doing in other fields besides athletics if we mean to make the most of our colleges and win our young men back to the pleasures of an intellectual life.

APPENDIX I.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

I. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH
AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION

In accordance with the resolution adopted during the 23rd Annual Convention a committee was appointed, of which the undersigned was chairman, for the purpose of discussing with a similar committee of the Amateur Athletic Union the relations between their respective organizations.

The joint committees met in New York City, April 1929, and reached an amicable agreement which resulted in amendments in the Constitution and By-Laws of the A. A. U. of certain provisions providing for competition of undergraduates in athletic meets held under the jurisdiction of that body. The pertinent governing articles of the A. A. U. now read as follows:—

Proof of qualification for competition shall be either

- (a) Registration or
- (b) Certification.

(a) REGISTRATION.

Registration grants to the one registered the privileges of competing, subject to the rules and limitations, as imposed by the A. A. U., in any competition, exhibition, game, or entertainment, given or sanctioned by the A. A. U., and to do so for a period of one calendar year from the date of registration.

(b) CERTIFICATION.

Certification grants to the one certified the privilege of competing, subject to the rules and limitations as imposed by the A. A. U., in one designed competition, exhibition, game, or entertainment, given or sanctioned by the A. A. U.

A competitor, at the same time, may be both registered and certified, and may be registered as from one club, educational institution, or other organization, and certified from another.

Actual or previous membership in a club, educational institution, or other organization is no disability to competing unattached.

Bona fide matriculation and actual attendance at a university, college, school, or other educational institution may be considered by such student as his residence during such period, within such A. A. U. territory, and may, as such, be added to the period of actual residence in such district acquired and maintained either before or after such institutional residence.

General.

No one shall compete, or be granted permission to compete, as a representative of any club, educational institution, or other organization in any competition, exhibition, game, or entertainment, given or sanctioned by the A. A. U., unless it is that such competitor is a member in good standing of the organization he seeks to represent, and is certified as such by that organization.

No one shall compete or be granted permission to compete in any competition, exhibition, game, or entertainment, given or sanctioned by the A. A. U., as a representative of any club, educational institution, or other organization, if it is that within the period of one year prior thereto the competitor has taken part in A. A. U. competition as a member of any other club, educational institution, or other organization.

Competition by University, College, or School Students.

Actual bona fide matriculation, or the equivalent, and the physical attendance during term time of undergraduate students of an educational institution which is a member of the A. A. U. or of an allied body of the A. A. U., or of a group member of the A. A. U., or of an educational institution, certified to the A. A. U. as of high reputation by a *scholastical organization* of a standing satisfactory to the *Registration Committee* of the district of the competition, may be considered by such student as *entitling him to the following privileges*.

(a) *During term time*, to represent his college or other educational institution, by and with the registration or certification so to do, sanctioned by his educational institution, and to do so without the requirement of the four months, six months, or twelve months period of intervention, as set down in Article K-VI.

(b) *During other than term time*, to represent his college or other educational institution, by and with the registration or certification so to do, sanctioned by his educational institution, when his actual residence at such time is other than that of the territory of his educational institution, and to do so without the necessary intervention of the four months, six months, and twelve months period, as set down in Article K-VI.

(c) *During other than term time*, to represent his college or other educational institution, by and with the registration or certification so to do, sanctioned by his educational institution, when his actual residence is that of the territory of his college, and to do so without the intervention of the four months, six months, and twelve months period, referred to in Article K-VI.

(d) *During term time*, to represent a club, or organization other than his college, such club or organization being within the territorial district in which the student's educational institution is located, but not within the territory or district of the student's

actual residence, but to do so, the four months, six months, and twelve months period of intervention shall apply, except that in calculating such period of time the student's period of academic residence at his educational institution may be considered.

(e) *During term time*, to represent a club or organization other than his educational institution, when it is that such club or other organization is not located within the territorial district of his educational institution but is within the territory or district of the student's actual residence, but the four months, six months, and twelve months period of intervention shall apply, except that in calculating such period of time, the student's academic residence at his educational institution may be ignored.

(f) *During other than term time*, to represent a club or other organization, within the district of the educational institution of which he is a student, but the four months, six months, and twelve months period of intervention shall apply, except that in calculating such period of time the student's academic residence at his educational institution may be considered.

(g) *During other than term time*, to represent a club or other organization which is not located within the territorial district of his educational institution, but the four months, six months, and twelve months period of intervention shall apply, except that in calculating such period of time the student's academic residence at his educational institution may be ignored.

(h) If it is that a student, upon ceasing to be such, or during any period when his educational institution is not in session, returns to the home of his actual residence, the period in which he was a student at his university, college, or school, shall not be considered, in determining whether or not he has fulfilled the requisite four months, six months, or twelve months period of residence at his actual abode, or, if he be a minor, of that of his parents or guardian.

10. In the case of cadets of the United States Military Academy and midshipmen of the United States Naval Academy, and also in the case of undergraduates representing a well recognized university or college which has and maintains a system of investigation and recording of the amateur status and other sports competitive qualifications of its students, the officially designated representative of such institution may present such cadets, midshipmen, or students for registration by the Registration Committee of the district of such institution by paying the registration fee and submitting a duly executed certificate to the effect that the entrant is an amateur according to the rules of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and is otherwise eligible and authorized to compete. The form of which certificate shall be drawn up and furnished by the Registration Committee. "Officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and

Marine Corps, may be accepted for competition upon the certification of the Commanding Officer or Athletic Officer of the Unit of the arm of the service which the athlete desires to represent in open competition that such athlete is an amateur under the rules of the Amateur Athletic Union."

Also by inserting the following and renumbering the succeeding sections on "Certification of Students".

When a university, college, or school enters one of its students for A. A. U. competition, or where such a student seeks to represent his university, college, or school, by and with the sanction of his educational institution, at any competition, exhibition, game, or entertainment, to be given or sanctioned by the A. A. U., such competitor must be either registered with the A. A. U. or certified by his educational institution as of high character, as matriculated in, of actual attendance at, and of good standing in his educational institution, and as eligible to compete under the Amateur Laws of the A. A. U., and such certification shall be accepted by the A. A. U. on the payment of the requisite fee of 10 cents, and, if it is that such certification has been made by an educational institution, which is a member of the A. A. U., or of an allied body of the A. A. U., or of any group member of the A. A. U., or is one which has been certified to the A. A. U., as of high standing by a representative collegiate body.

The mere presentation of such a certification does not grant to the student the privilege of competition. It merely lays before the Registration Committee of the Territorial Member of the A. A. U. the prima facie facts required by the A. A. U. for permission to compete. The Registration Committee may approve or disapprove such application, may ask for additional information, or take such steps as it deems wise and necessary to inform itself as to the points involved and, as in the application for registration, may reject the same.

When the application for certification has been accepted, the one certified submits himself during the period of his competition to all the rules and regulations as set down by the A. A. U. applying to such competition.

PALMER E. PIERCE,
Chairman.

II. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION

In accordance with a resolution unanimously adopted during the 23rd Annual Conference of The National Collegiate Athletic Association, a committee was constituted to consist of the officers and council and additional members to have special supervision of the relations of the N. C. A. A. to the American Olympic Association. This committee appeared before the following representatives of the American Olympic Association at the New York Athletic Club December 30, 1929:

Chairman, Frederick W. Rubien, Secretary, American Olympic Association.

Members: Avery Brundage, President, Amateur Athletic Union,
Major W. C. Rose, U. S. Army,
Commander L. McC. Jones, U. S. Navy,
Professor C. W. Kennedy,
Mr. A. C. Gilbert,
Julian Myrick,
Gustavus T. Kirby.

The Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was as follows:

General Palmer E. Pierce, Chairman.
Mr. Romeyn Berry, Cornell University,
Director W. J. Bingham, Harvard University,
Mr. J. M. Cates, Yale University,
Dean C. E. Friley, Texas A & M College,
Mr. Harry Hillman, Dartmouth College,
Professor C. W. Kennedy, Princeton University,
Professor W. R. La Porte, University of Southern California,
Professor O. F. Long, Northwestern University,
Professor W. B. Owens, Stanford University,
Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University,
Professor D. A. Penick, University of Texas,
Dr. J. E. Raycroft, Princeton University,
Dean S. V. Sanford, University of Georgia,
Professor D. B. Swingle, Rocky Mt. Conference,
Mr. F. H. Yost, University of Michigan.

After the preliminaries of the meeting the chairman of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Committee read the following statement:

This committee presents the following suggestions for the consideration of the committee representing the American Olympic Association:

1. There should be a reorganization through amendments to the present Constitution and By Laws.

In general the purposes of these changes should be:

- (a) Simplification.
- (b) A democratic organization truly representative of the athletic bodies interested in the games on the Olympic program.

In order to carry out the reforms indicated above, the following specific changes are recommended for consideration by the committee representative of the A. O. A.:

- I. Revision of membership lists into two classes:
 - a. Active members with voting power consisting of organizations that directly and regularly initiate, develop, and govern those sports included in the Olympic program.
 - b. Associate members without voting power consisting of groups or individuals interested in the participation of the United States in the Olympic games, that do not promote any sports on the Olympic games program.
3. Readjustment of the relative voting strength of the voting members of the Association.
- II. All decisions of the Olympic Association and its committees shall require $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote.
- III. The selection at the quadrennial meeting of an Executive Committee with power to form and organize in all particulars an American Olympic Committee which shall have jurisdiction of all matters pertaining to the participation of the United States in the Olympic games; that this committee be required
 - a. To appoint a selection committee empowered to determine finally the competitors to represent the United States.
 - b. To select with the greatest care the managers, coaches, assistant coaches, trainers, and games officials for their ability, character, personality;—distributing the appointments so that adequate and democratic representation as well as proper and regional distribution shall result. It should be required especially that the managers in charge of America's Olympic teams be selected from men who by training are experienced in the handling of large movements of athletic personnel, and the other details naturally incident to the management of an important athletic program.
- IV. To the end that there may be complete separation between all financial considerations and questions having to do with the selection of America's representatives in the Olympic games, it is suggested that a permanent standing committee of the Olympic Association, with adequate representation of the colleges, be created to have charge of the raising and handling of funds for American participation in the Olympic program, and it is suggested that this Finance Committee as far as possible have its work completed at least a year before the team is selected. It is further suggested that this Finance Committee give careful consideration to the possibility of raising a capital sum of \$2,000,000.00 for the permanent funding of American Olympic participation.

It is hoped that the above suggestions of the Committee of the National Collegiate Athletic Association will be helpful to the Committee of the American Olympic Association.

At the conclusion of the reading of this report there was a general and amicable discussion of the matters set forth in the statement. The conference was harmonious, and it is believed the committee of the American Olympic Association will give sympathetic and careful consideration to the changes in organization and methods suggested to them by your representatives. There seemed to be a unanimity of opinion that reorganization of the A. O. A. which will make of it a more truly national, democratic, and patriotic organization, truly representative of amateur athletics throughout the United States, is advisable.

It is our understanding that the reorganization committee of the American Olympic Association will give careful study to the recommendations of others, as well as those of your committee. There will be a meeting of the American Olympic Association within the next two or three months to consider reorganization.

PALMER E. PIERCE,
Chairman.

APPENDIX II

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE NATIONAL
COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

As amended January 1, 1930

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I.

NAME

The name of this organization shall be "The National Collegiate Athletic Association."

ARTICLE II.

PURPOSES

The purposes of this Association are:

- (1) The upholding of the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all collegiate sports.
- (2) The stimulation and improvement of intramural and intercollegiate athletic sports.
- (3) The promotion of physical exercise among the students of the educational institutions of the United States.
- (4) The establishment of a uniform law of amateurism and of principles of amateur sports.
- (5) The encouragement of the adoption by its constituent members of strict eligibility rules to comply with high standards of scholarship, amateur standing, and good sportsmanship.
- (6) The formulation, copyrighting, and publication of rules of play for the government of collegiate sports.
- (7) The supervision of the regulation and conduct, by its constituent members, of intercollegiate sports in regional and national collegiate athletic contests, and the preservation of collegiate athletic records.
- (8) In general, the study of the various phases of competitive athletics, physical training, and allied problems, the establishment of standards for amateur sports, and the promotion of the adoption of recommended measures, to the end that the colleges and universities of the United States may maintain their athletic activities on a high plane and may make efficient use of sports for character building.

ARTICLE III.

MEMBERSHIP

SECTION 1. All colleges, universities, and institutions of learning in the United States are eligible to membership in this Association.

SEC. 2. Membership shall be of the following classes:

1. Active.
2. Allied.
3. Associate.

SEC. 3. *Active Members* shall consist of colleges and universities duly elected under and conforming to the provisions of this constitution and by-laws.

SEC. 4. *Allied Members* shall consist of local athletic conferences of colleges and universities duly elected under and conforming to the provisions of this constitution and by-laws.

SEC. 5. *Associate Members* shall consist of institutions of learning, not included among the colleges and universities eligible to active membership, duly elected under and conforming to the provisions of this constitution and by-laws.

SEC. 6. Election to active membership requires an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the delegates present at an annual conference. After election, active membership is consummated by the payment of dues for the next succeeding year.

SEC. 7. Election to allied and associate membership requires a majority vote of the delegates present at an annual conference or a majority vote of the Council.

ARTICLE IV.

ORGANIZATION

SECTION 1. For the purpose of this Association, the United States shall be divided into eight athletic districts as follows:

1. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.
2. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia.
3. Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, Florida.
4. Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota.
5. Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma.
6. Texas, Arizona, Arkansas.
7. Wyoming, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Montana.
8. California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Nevada.

ARTICLE V.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP

The members of this Association severally agree to supervise and, in so far as may be practicable, to control athletic sports so that they will be administered in accord with the law of amateurism and the principles of amateur sport set forth in this constitution, and to establish and preserve high standards of personal honor, eligibility, and fair play. The self-government of the constituent members shall not be interfered with or questioned.

ARTICLE VI.

REPRESENTATION OF MEMBERS

SECTION 1. Each active and allied member shall be entitled to one vote and may be represented at the annual convention and at special meetings by from one to three delegates.

Each associate member shall be entitled to one delegate without voting power.

Member as well as non-member institutions are authorized to send visiting delegates who shall be without voting power and shall not actively participate in the business proceedings of the Association.

SEC. 2. Delegates shall be certified to the Secretary as entitled to represent the member in question by the proper executive officers of their institutions or organizations.

In case an active or allied member is represented by more than one delegate each delegate shall be entitled to cast a fractional vote which shall be in proportion to the number of delegates representing his institution or organization.

Whenever the Association votes to take a formal ballot, either written or *viva voce*, on any question, the names of the delegates as they vote will be checked by the Committee on Credentials in order to verify the authority of the voter. Only accredited and not visiting delegates may vote, and not more than three representatives of either an active or an allied member may share in a proportional vote as defined in the preceding paragraph. Voting by proxy is not allowed. The same delegate may represent both an active and an allied member (that is, a college and a conference) on presenting proper credentials.

SEC. 3. Each of the rules committees shall have in its membership at least one representative of the intercollegiate associations that conduct competitions in the corresponding sport.

ARTICLE VII.

AMATEURISM

SECTION 1. The National Collegiate Athletic Association adopts the following definition: "*An amateur sportsman is one who engages in sport solely for the physical, mental, or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom the sport is nothing more than an avocation.*"

SEC. 2. *Principles of Amateur Sports.* In the opinion of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the spirit of amateurism carries with it all that is included in the definition of an amateur and much more. It stands for a high sense of honor, honesty, fair play, and courtesy. It stoops to no petty technicalities and refuses to twist or avoid the rules of play, or to take an unfair advantage of opponents.

SEC. 3. The following acts are considered violations of amateurism:

(1) Competition or exercise in any sport under an assumed name, with intent to deceive.

(2) Directly or indirectly receiving pay or financial benefit in consideration of, or as a reward for, participating in any sport in any public competition or exhibition, or disposing of prizes for personal gain.

(3) Directly or indirectly receiving pay or financial benefits in consideration of, or as a reward for, instructing or appearing in person in or for any competition, exhibition, or exercise in any sport.

(4) Intentional violation of the laws of eligibility established by the educational institution of which he is a member.

(5) Fraudulent representation of facts or other grossly unsportsmanlike conduct in connection with any sport or the rules governing it.

(6) Participation in any public competition or exhibition as a member of a team upon which there are one or more members who have received, do receive, or who are to receive, directly or indirectly, pay or financial benefits for participation without having obtained, as a condition precedent, the consent in writing from the proper Faculty authority.

ARTICLE VIII.

MEETINGS

SECTION 1. There shall be an annual convention of this Association during the last week of December or the first week of January, at such time and place as the Council may determine.

SEC. 2. Special meetings of the Association may be called by a majority vote of the Council.

SEC. 3. Thirty universities or colleges represented as prescribed in this constitution shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ARTICLE IX.

AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any annual convention by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting; provided that the proposed amendment shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary of the Association at least three weeks before the convention meets; and further provided that a copy of the proposed amendment shall have been duly sent to all members of the Association.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I.

SECTION 1. The officers of this Association shall consist of a president, eight vice-presidents (one from each athletic district), and a secretary-treasurer.

ARTICLE II.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SECTION 1. The president shall preside at the meeting of the Association and of the Council. He shall call a meeting of the Council whenever necessary, and a meeting of the Association when requested in writing by ten or more of the institutions enrolled as members. In the absence of the President, or in case he is incapacitated from serving, one of the vice-presidents to be chosen by him shall take his place and perform his duties.

SEC. 2. A vice-president shall represent the president in his district. He shall act as an arbitrator, to whom charges and rumors of infraction within his district of the agreement to uphold the law of amateurism and the principles of amateur sport may be referred. He shall carefully observe and supervise the conduct of intercollegiate athletics within his district, encourage the holding of the regional athletic contests, and forward to the secretary of the Association the athletic records made. He shall appoint an advisory committee of three or more to assist in the performance of his duties. He shall render a report in writing to the annual convention on the following points, and this report should be in the hands of the secretary at least one month before the meeting:

- (1) The degree of strictness with which the provisions of the constitution and by-laws and the existing eligibility rules have been enforced during the year;
- (2) Modifications or additions to the eligibility code made by institutions, individually or concertedly;
- (3) Progress toward uniformity in the conduct of sports and of the activities of intercollegiate athletic associations and local athletic conferences or leagues;
- (4) District competitions, if any;
- (5) Any other facts or recommendations that may be of interest to the Association.

SEC. 3. The secretary-treasurer shall keep records of the meetings of the Association and the Council. He shall report at each annual convention the proceedings of the Council during the preceding year. He shall print such matter as the Association

or the Council may direct. He shall have charge of all funds of the Association, and shall submit at the annual convention a detailed report of all receipts and disbursements which, after being audited, shall be printed in the annual Proceedings.

ARTICLE III.

GOVERNMENT

SECTION 1. A Council shall be elected at each annual meeting of the Association for a term of one year. The government and general direction of the affairs of the Association in the interim of the meetings shall be committed to this Council, which shall be constituted as follows:

(a) One representative from each of the eight geographical districts—to be selected from the Faculty.

(b) Seven members at large—to be selected by the Council.

(c) The president and the secretary-treasurer shall be *ex-officio* members of the Council. For the transaction of business, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Council.

SEC. 2. An Executive Committee of seven shall be elected by the Council from its members to serve for one year under the direction and general instructions of the Council. The president and the secretary-treasurer shall be *ex-officio* members of the Executive Committee. For the transaction of business a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee. This committee shall represent the Council and act for them in the general conduct of the affairs of the Association not otherwise provided for in the Constitution and By-laws. It shall render a report of its proceedings to the Council on the day prior to the annual convention.

SEC. 3. The Council shall meet as follows:

- (1) Immediately after election;
- (2) The day prior to the annual convention;
- (3) At such other times as the president may direct.

It is empowered to transact such of the business of the Association as it may deem wise by correspondence—such action, however, to be noted by the secretary in his minutes and laid before the Association at its next meeting. The president may, of his own motion, or upon the written request of three members of the Council, submit to a vote by mail any question which might properly be passed upon at a meeting of the Council.

SEC. 4. In case of a vacancy occurring among the officers of the Association or of the Council, or committees formed at an

annual convention, the Council by a majority vote may fill the vacancy. The elected member will be eligible to serve until the next annual meeting thereafter.

ARTICLE IV.

RULES COMMITTEES

SECTION 1. The Executive Committee, prior to the annual convention, shall appoint a committee on committees, who shall report to the convention through the Council nominees for the following rules committees:

(1) Football; (2) Soccer; (3) Basket ball; (4) Swimming; (5) Volley ball; (6) Boxing; (7) Track; (8) Wrestling; (9) Hockey; (10) Fencing; (11) Gymnastics; (12) Lacrosse; (13) Publication; (14) Preservation of College Athletic Records; (15) Arbitration; and others as necessity may arise.

Rules of play prepared by any of the above-named committees shall be submitted to the Publication Committee, and on approval by the Executive Committee shall be published. These committees shall where possible coöperate with other national organizations in the publishing of joint rules. The chairman of each of the above committees shall report annually to the Executive Committee in writing the activities of his committee during the year. The Executive Committee shall take the necessary action on this reports.

SEC. 2. Nominations for the committees listed in Section 1 shall be submitted to the annual convention by the Council.

ARTICLE V.

ANNUAL DUES

SECTION 1. The annual dues of each active member shall be twenty-five dollars.

SEC. 2. The annual dues of associate members shall be ten dollars.

SEC. 3. The annual dues of allied members shall be twenty-five dollars, but no dues shall be required of an allied member when a majority of its constituents are also members of this Association.

ARTICLE VI.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

At meetings of this Association, the order of business shall be as follows:

- (1) Reading of minutes of previous meeting;
- (2) Appointment of a Committee on Credentials;
- (3) Appointment of a Committee on Nominations;
- (4) Reports of officers and committees;
- (5) Miscellaneous business;
- (6) Election of officers and committees;
- (7) Adjournment.

ARTICLE VII.

ELIGIBILITY RULES

The acceptance of a definite set of eligibility rules shall not be a requirement of membership in this Association. The constituted authorities of each institution shall decide on the methods necessary to uphold the law of amateurism and to carry out the principles of sport as enunciated in Article VII of the Constitution.

ARTICLE VIII.

AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting at any annual convention of this Association, provided that notice of the proposed amendment shall have been sent at least three weeks before the date of the meeting to the institutions enrolled.

APPENDIX III

REPORT OF THE TREASURER, 1929

FRANK W. NICOLSON, *Treasurer*, in account with the

National Collegiate Athletic Association

1928

		DR.	
	To balance forward		\$7,401.65
Jan.	1 Northwestern University		50.00
	Clemson Agricultural College		25.00
	University of Georgia		50.00
	Manhattan College		25.00
	Washington University (St. Louis)		25.00
	Syracuse University		25.00
	University of Pittsburgh		25.00
	University of Colorado		25.00
	American Sports Publishing Co.		
	Football	\$1,424.40	
	Soccer	255.48	
	Wrestling	28.42	
	Track	102.48	1,810.78
	11 College of the City of New York		25.00
	14 Centre College		25.00
	26 University of Detroit		50.00
Feb.	1 Michigan Agricultural College		25.00
	Villanova College		25.00
	15 U. S. Military Academy		25.00
	Phillips Academy, Andover		10.00
	18 Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Conference		50.00
	21 University of Wisconsin		25.00
	23 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference		25.00
	25 University of Buffalo		25.00
Mar.	14 Bowdoin College		25.00
	15 Worcester Polytechnic Institute		25.00
	Colgate University		25.00
	University of Kansas		25.00
	18 U. S. Naval Academy		50.00
	Washington and Jefferson College		25.00
	Yale College		25.00
	Marquette University		25.00
	Hamilton College		25.00
	Virginia Military Institute		25.00
	Hobart College		25.00
	Mount Union College		25.00
	Dartmouth College		25.00
	University of Pennsylvania		25.00
	New York Military Academy		10.00
	A. A. Stagg, N. C. A. A. Track meet		13.99
	23 Indiana University		50.00
	Carleton College		25.00
	Lafayette College		25.00
	Knox College		25.00
	Oberlin College		25.00

		Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
		University of Rochester	25.00	
		University of Vermont	25.00	
		Ohio Wesleyan University	25.00	
		The Principia	10.00	
	25	University of Missouri	25.00	
		Tulane University	25.00	
		Wittenberg College	25.00	
Apr.	1	Drake University	25.00	
		Williams College	25.00	
		Alfred University	25.00	
		Franklin and Marshall College	25.00	
		Brown University	25.00	
		Pennsylvania State College	25.00	
		Wesleyan University	25.00	
	3	Iowa State College	25.00	
		Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Association	25.00	
		Washington and Lee University	25.00	
	9	Stanford University	25.00	
	10	Catholic University	25.00	
	11	Trinity College	25.00	
	15	John B. Stetson University	25.00	
		Georgia School of Technology	25.00	
		Boston College	50.00	
	16	Stevens Institute	25.00	
		St. Stephen's College	25.00	
	17	Swarthmore College	25.00	
	19	Vanderbilt University	25.00	
	20	American Sports Publishing Co.,		
		Ice Hockey	\$43.82	
		Soccer	69.38	
		Swimming	70.92	184.12
	22	Loyola University	25.00	
		Howard University	25.00	
		Mississippi A. & M. College	25.00	
May	21	Interest, Savings Bank (track meet)	27.62	
June	14	Oregon Agricultural College	25.00	
Aug.	26	Interest, Savings Bank	176.12	
Oct.	3	Rochester Athenaeum	10.00	
	8	Howard University	25.00	
	11	Michigan Collegiate Conference	25.00	
	15	Pennsylvania Military College	25.00	
	17	University of California	25.00	
	28	Midwest Athletic Conference	25.00	
	31	Worcester Academy	10.00	
Nov.	2	Mercersburg Academy	10.00	
		University of Akron	25.00	
		Susquehanna University	25.00	
		Clarkson College	25.00	
	3	Amherst College	25.00	
		Cornell University	25.00	
		Lawrenceville School	10.00	
	4	University of Cincinnati	25.00	
		Centre College	25.00	
		University of Tennessee	25.00	
	7	Pacific Northwest Conference	25.00	
		Duke University	25.00	
		Fordham University	25.00	

	Butler University	50.00
	Michigan Agricultural College	25.00
	Rutgers College	25.00
	University of New Hampshire	25.00
8	College of St. Thomas	50.00
	Middlebury College	25.00
	Wooster College	25.00
	Syracuse University	25.00
	Lehigh University	25.00
	University of Delaware	25.00
	New York University	25.00
	University of Georgia	25.00
9	University of the South	25.00
11	DePauw University	25.00
	University of Maine	25.00
	University of Pittsburgh	25.00
	Union College	25.00
	Lawrence College	25.00
	Kansas Agricultural College	25.00
	Alabama Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Baylor University	25.00
	Haverford College	25.00
	Mount St. Mary's College	25.00
	Rice Institute	25.00
13	University of North Carolina	25.00
	Michigan State Normal College	25.00
	Denison University	25.00
14	University School	10.00
15	Massachusetts Agricultural College	25.00
	Columbia University	25.00
16	Georgetown University	25.00
	Miami University	25.00
	Kansas College Athletic Association	25.00
18	Texas A. & M. College	25.00
	University of Michigan	25.00
	Case School of Applied Science	25.00
	Coe College	25.00
	University of Florida	25.00
10	University of Chicago	25.00
21	Bradley Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Ohio State University	25.00
	North Carolina College of Agriculture and Engin- eering	50.00
22	Carnegie Institute of Technology	25.00
23	Bates College	25.00
	Creighton University	25.00
25	University of Oklahoma	25.00
	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	25.00
	Purdue University	25.00
	University of Virginia	50.00
	Grinnell College	25.00
	Western State Teachers College	25.00
	Washington University	25.00
	University of Colorado	25.00
28	Connecticut Agricultural College	25.00
30	International Y. M. C. A. College	25.00
Dec. 3	Harvard University	25.00
	Rhode Island State College	25.00
	University of Minnesota	50.00
5	University of Oregon	25.00

6	College of the City of New York	25.00	
	Johns Hopkins University	25.00	
7	University of Illinois	25.00	
9	Allegheny College	25.00	
10	Boston University	25.00	
16	A. A. Stagg, N. C. A. A. Meet	104.49	
	American Sports Publishing Co.,		
	Football	\$1,698.60	
	Wrestling	27.92	
	Track	90.34	1,816.86
	Virginia Intercollegiate Conference	25.00	
	St. Lawrence College	25.00	
	University of Notre Dame	25.00	
	Temple University	25.00	
	Northwestern University	25.00	
17	State University of Iowa	50.00	
	Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference	25.00	
19	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00	
20	Southern Methodist University	25.00	
	Ohio University	25.00	
	University of Texas	25.00	
26	Duquesne University	25.00	
	West Virginia University	25.00	
	University of Dayton	25.00	
	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	50.00	
Dec. 31	Interest	27.02	
			\$16,042.65

CR.

1929			
Jan. 1	American Sports Publishing Co., Football Rules Committee	\$129.74	
	Hotel Roosevelt, convention expenses	50.00	
	F. W. Nicolson, travelling expenses	157.51	
	convention expenses	52.50	
2	Pelton and King, printing	10.00	
	Bishop W. T. Manning, contribution	500.00	
	National Amateur Athletic Federation, contribution	500.00	
10	W. S. Langford, Football Rules Committee	169.75	
	F. E. Zimmer & Co., convention expenses	25.00	
	James Gray, Inc., convention expenses	39.89	
17	Wesleyan Store, postage	20.00	
25	J. E. Raycroft, expenses to N. A. A. F. meeting	17.50	
Feb. 4	Wesleyan Store, stencils	2.00	
	Pelton and King, printing	91.25	
19	F. W. Nicolson, Executive Committee	10.00	
20	American Olympic Association, dues	30.00	
	A. A. Stagg, advance on N. C. A. A. meet	300.00	
Mar. 1	G. M. Trautman, Wrestling Rules Committee	60.00	
2	Wesleyan Store, stencils	5.80	
	J. L. Griffith, Executive Committee	111.50	
5	Pelton and King, printing	557.05	
18	H. W. Hughes, Football Rules Committee	180.14	
26	D. X. Bible, Football Rules Committee	220.11	
Apr. 8	F. W. Luehring, Swimming Rules Committee	93.20	
	R. J. H. Kiphuth, Swimming Rules Committee	145.07	
	E. T. Kennedy, Swimming Rules Committee	158.48	
	R. G. Clapp, Wrestling Rules Committee	118.87	
12	W. C. O'Connell, Wrestling Rules Committee	64.10	

	15	F. W. Nicolson, Executive Committee	16.00
	16	R. A. Fetzer, Wrestling Rules Committee	80.47
	20	J. L. Griffith, Executive Committee	127.50
	23	O. F. Long, Executive Committee	120.70
		P. E. Pierce, Executive Committee	42.40
	27	W. S. Langford, Football Rules Committee	60.10
May	1	J. A. Rockwell, Wrestling Rules Committee	113.60
	3	E. E. Wieman, Hockey Rules Committee	78.24
	4	H. J. Stegeman, Football Rules Committee	131.79
	9	L. W. St. John, Basket Ball Rules Committee	190.72
		F. A. Schmidt, Basket Ball Rules Committee	142.20
		G. K. Tebell, Basket Ball Rules Committee	85.12
		J. F. Bohler, Basket Ball Rules Committee	302.76
	10	A. I. Prettyman, Hockey Rules Committee	37.93
	13	R. G. Clapp, Wrestling Rules Committee	21.16
	18	E. A. Thomas, Track Rules Committee	64.25
		W. A. Alexander, Track Rules Committee	101.96
June	20	W. E. Meanwell, Basket Ball Rules Committee	135.89
		E. L. Roberts, Basket Ball Rules Committee	281.35
		C. L. Brewer, Basket Ball Rules Committee	143.68
	24	F. W. Nicolson, discount, money borrowed from savings bank	9.50
		C. Haymond, Track Rules Committee	135.71
July	5	J. L. Griffith, Track Rules Committee	46.75
	8	R. Morgan, Basket Ball Rules Committee	15.96
	16	A. A. Stagg, N. C. A. A. track and field meet	500.00
	20	F. W. Nicolson, secretarial appropriation	500.00
Sept.	26	F. W. Nicolson, Executive Committee	10.00
	30	J. L. Griffith, Executive Committee	124.70
Oct.	19	P. S. Harburger, Swimming Rules Committee	127.74
	23	Wesleyan Store, postage	25.00
Nov.	2	American Olympic Association, dues	30.00
	3	Wesleyan Store, addressing envelopes	1.25
		Pelton and King, printing	22.50
	7	L. W. St. John, Executive Committee	71.61
	22	American Sports Publishing Co., Committee on Pub- lication of the Rules	5.81
Dec.	6	Whitehead and Hoag, badges	32.68
	9	H. P. Osborn, Hockey Rules Committee	3.50
	10	Wesleyan Store, postage	15.00
	19	P. E. Pierce, expenses of President's office	103.12
		Balance forward	8,164.54
			<hr/>
			\$16,042.65